arXiv:1111.7270v1 [math.PR] 30 Nov 2011

Noise as a Boolean algebra of σ-fields

Boris Tsirelson

Abstract

The black noise of two-dimensional percolation, disclosed recently by O. Schramm, S. Smirnov and C. Garban, exceeds the limits of the existing framework based on one-dimensional intervals. A remake of the theory of noises, provided here, treats them as Boolean algebras of σ-fields. Completeness of the Boolean algebra implies classicality, which answers an old question of J. Feldman.

Contents

Introduction **2**

1 Main results **4**
1a Definitions 4
1b The simplest nonclassical example 5
1c On Feldman's question 6
1d On completion 6
1e On sufficient subalgebras and black noises 7

2 Preliminaries **8**
2a Type L_2 subspaces 8
2b Strong operator convergence 10
2c Independence and tensor products 11
2d Measure class spaces and commutative von Neumann algebras 12
2e Boolean algebras 15
2f Measurable functions and equivalence classes 16

3 Convergence of σ-fields and independence **17**
3a Definition of the convergence 17
3b Commuting σ-fields 18
3c Independent σ-fields 19
3d Product σ-fields 20

4 Noise-type completion **21**
4a The closure; proving Theorem 1d1 22
4b The completion; proving Theorem 1d2 23

5 Classicality and blackness **25**
5a Atomless algebras 25
5b The first chaos; proving Proposition 1d4 27
5c Sufficient subalgebras; proving Theorem 1e2 28

6 The easy part of Theorem 1c2 **29**
6a From (a) to (b) 29
6b From (b) to (c) 31

7 The difficult part of Theorem 1c2 **32**
7a A random supremum 32
7b Spectrum as a measure class factorization 33
7c Restriction to a sub-σ-field 35
7d Classicality via spectrum 36
7e Finishing the proof 39

References **41**

Introduction

The product of two measure spaces, widely known among mathematicians, leads to the tensor product of the corresponding Hilbert spaces L_2. The less widely known product of an infinite sequence of probability spaces leads to the so-called infinite tensor product space. A continuous product of probability spaces, used in the theory of noises, leads to a continuous tensor product of Hilbert spaces, used in noncommutative dynamics. Remarkable parallelism and fruitful interrelations between the two theories of continuous products, commutative (probability) and noncommutative (operator algebras) are noted [19], [16], [18].

The classical theory, developed in the 20 century, deals with independent increments (Levy processes) in the commutative case, and quasi-free representations of canonical commutation relations (Fock spaces) in the noncommutative case. These classical continuous products are well-understood, except for one condition of classicality, whose sufficiency was conjectured by H. Araki and E.J. Woods in 1996 [1, p. 210] in the noncommutative case (still open), and by J. Feldman in 1971 [8, Problem 1.9] in the commutative case (now proved).

Araki and Woods note [1, p. 161–162] that lattices of von Neumann algebras occur in quantum field theory and quantum statistical mechanics; these algebras correspond to domains in space-time or space; in most interesting cases they fail to be a Boolean algebra of type I factors. As a first step towards understanding of such structures, Araki and Woods investigate "factorizations", — complete Boolean algebras of type I factors, — leaving aside their relation to the domains in space(-time), and conjecture that all such factorizations contain sufficiently many factorizable vectors.

Feldman defines "factored probability spaces" that are in fact complete Boolean algebras of sub-σ-fields (corresponding to Borel subsets of a parameter space, which does not really matter), investigates them assuming sufficiently many "decomposable processes" (basically the same as factorizable vectors) and asks, whether this assumption holds always, or not.

In both cases the authors failed to prove that the completeness of the Boolean algebra implies classicality (via sufficiently many factorizable vectors).

In both cases the authors did not find any nonclassical factorizations, and did not formulate an appropriate framework for these. This challenge in the noncommutative case was met in 1987 by R.T. Powers [12] ("type III product system"), and in the commutative case in 1998 by A.M. Vershik and myself [19] ("black noise"). In both cases the framework was, an incomplete Boolean algebra indexed by one-dimensional intervals and their finite unions. More interesting nonclassical noises were found soon (see the survey [18]), but the first highly important example is given recently by O. Schramm, S. Smirnov and C. Garban [13], — the noise of percolation, a conformally invariant black noise over the plane.

Being indexed by planar domains (whose needed regularity depends on some properties of the noise), such a noise exceeds the limits of the existing framework based on one-dimensional intervals. Abandoning the intervals, it is natural to return to the Boolean algebras, leaving aside (once again!) their relations to planar (or more general) domains; this time, however, the Boolean algebra is generally incomplete.

The present article provides a remake of the theory of noises, treated here as Boolean algebras of σ-fields. Completeness of the Boolean algebra implies classicality, which answers the question of Feldman.

The noncommutative case is still waiting for a similar treatment.

1 Main results

1a Definitions

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a probability space; that is, Ω is a set, $\mathcal{F}$ a σ-field (in other words, σ-algebra) of its subsets (throughout, every σ-field is assumed to contain all null sets), and P a probability measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$. We assume that $L_2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ is separable. The set Λ of all sub-σ-fields of $\mathcal{F}$ is partially ordered (by inclusion: $x \le y$ means $x \subset y$ for $x, y \in \Lambda$), and is a lattice:

$$x \wedge y = x \cap y\,, \quad x \vee y = \sigma(x, y) \qquad \text{for } x, y \in \Lambda\,;$$

here $\sigma(x, y)$ is the least σ-field containing both x and y. (See [4] for basics about lattices and Boolean algebras.) The greatest element 1_Λ of Λ is $\mathcal{F}$; the smallest element 0_Λ is the trivial σ-field (only null sets and their complements).

A subset $B \subset \Lambda$ is called a sublattice if $x \wedge y, x \vee y \in B$ for all $x, y \in B$. The sublattice is called distributive if $x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z)$ for all $x, y, z \in B$.

Let $B \subset \Lambda$ be a distributive sublattice, $0_\Lambda \in B$, $1_\Lambda \in B$. An element x of B is called complemented (in B), if $x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda$, $x \vee y = 1_\Lambda$ for some (necessarily unique) $y \in B$; in this case one says that y is the complement of x, and writes $y = x'$.

1a1 Definition. A *noise-type Boolean algebra* is a distributive sublattice $B \subset \Lambda$ such that $0_\Lambda \in B$, $1_\Lambda \in B$, all elements of B are complemented (in B), and for every $x \in B$ the σ-fields x, x' are independent (that is, $P(X \cap Y) = P(X)P(Y)$ for all $X \in x$, $Y \in y$).

From now on $B \subset \Lambda$ is a noise-type Boolean algebra.

1a2 Definition. The *first chaos space* $H^{(1)}(B)$ is a (closed linear) subspace of the Hilbert space $H = L_2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ consisting of all $f \in H$ such that

$$f = \mathbb{E}\bigl(f \,\big|\, x\bigr) + \mathbb{E}\bigl(f \,\big|\, x'\bigr) \qquad \text{for all } x \in B\,.$$

Here $\mathbb{E}\bigl(\cdot \,\big|\, x\bigr)$ is the conditional expectation, that is, the orthogonal projection onto the subspace H_x of all x-measurable elements of H.

1a3 Definition. (a) B is called *classical* if the first chaos space generates the whole σ-field $\mathcal{F}$.

(b) B is called *black* if the first chaos space contains only 0 (but $0_\Lambda \ne 1_\Lambda$).

The lattice Λ is complete, that is, every subset $X \subset \Lambda$ has infimum and supremum:

$$\inf X = \bigcap\nolimits_{x \in X} x\,, \quad \sup X = \sigma\Big(\bigcup\nolimits_{x \in X} x \Big)\,.$$

A noise-type Boolean algebra B is called complete if

$$(\inf X) \in B \quad \text{and} \quad (\sup X) \in B \qquad \text{for every } X \subset B\,.$$

1b The simplest nonclassical example

Let $\Omega = \{-1,1\}^\infty$ (all infinite sequences of ± 1) with the product measure μ^∞ where $\mu(\{-1\}) = \mu(\{1\}) = 1/2$. The coordinate projections $\xi_n : \Omega \to \{-1,1\}$, $\xi_n(s_1, s_2, \dots) = s_n$, treated as random variables, are independent random signs. The products $\xi_1\xi_2$, $\xi_2\xi_3$, $\xi_3\xi_4, \dots$ are also independent random signs.

We introduce σ-fields

$$x_n = \sigma(\xi_n, \xi_{n+1}, \dots) \quad \text{and} \quad y_n = \sigma(\xi_n \xi_{n+1}) \qquad \text{for } n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Then

$$\begin{gathered} 1_\Lambda = x_1 \ge x_2 \ge \dots\,; \\ y_n \le x_n\,; \\ y_1, \dots, y_n, x_{n+1} \text{ are independent}\,; \\ y_n \vee x_{n+1} = x_n\,. \end{gathered}$$

The independent σ-fields $y_1, \dots, y_n, x_{n+1}$ are atoms of a finite noise-type Boolean algebra B_n (containing 2^{n+1} elements), and $B_n \subset B_{n+1}$. The union

$$B = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup \dots$$

is an infinite noise-type Boolean algebra. Its first chaos space $H^{(1)}(B) = H^{(1)}(B_1) \cap H^{(1)}(B_2) \cap \dots$ consists of linear combinations

$$c_1 \xi_1 \xi_2 + c_2 \xi_2 \xi_3 + c_3 \xi_3 \xi_4 + \dots$$

for all $c_1, c_2, \dots \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $c_1^2 + c_2^2 + \dots < \infty$. It is not $\{0\}$, which shows that B is not black. On the other hand, all elements of $H^{(1)}(B)$ are invariant under the measure preserving transformation $(s_1, s_2, \dots) \mapsto (-s_1, -s_2, \dots)$; therefore $\sigma(H^{(1)}(B))$ is not the whole 1_Λ, which shows that B is not classical.

This example goes back to an unpublished dissertation of A. Vershik (1973). According to [7, p. 291] it is a paradigmatic example, well-known in ergodic theory, independently discovered by several authors. See also [20, Sect. 4.12], [18, Sect. 1b].

1c On Feldman's question

1c1 Theorem. If a noise-type Boolean algebra is complete then it is classical.

1c2 Theorem. The following conditions on a noise-type Boolean algebra B are equivalent:

(a) B is classical;

(b) there exists a complete noise-type Boolean algebra $\hat{B}$ such that $B \subset \hat{B}$;

(c) $\big(\sup_n x_n\big) \vee \big(\inf_n x'_n\big) = 1_\Lambda$ for all $x_n \in B$ such that $x_1 \le x_2 \le \dots$

1d On completion

Bad news: a noise-type Boolean algebra cannot be extended to a complete one unless it is classical. (See Theorem 1c2. True, every Boolean algebra admits a completion [9, Sect. 21], but not within Λ.)

Good news: an appropriate notion of completion exists and is described below (Definition 1d3).

The lower limit

$$\liminf_n x_n = \sup_n \inf_k x_{n+k}$$

is well-defined for arbitrary $x_1, x_2, \dots \in \Lambda$. (The upper limit is defined similarly.)

1d1 Theorem. Let B be a noise-type Boolean algebra and

$$\mathrm{Cl}(B) = \big\{ \liminf_n x_n : x_1, x_2, \dots \in B \big\}$$

(the set of lower limits of all sequences of elements of B). Then

(a) $(\inf_n x_n) \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ whenever $x_1, x_2, \dots \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$;

(b) $(\sup_n x_n) \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ whenever $x_1, x_2, \dots \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$, $x_1 \le x_2 \le \dots$

Thus, we add to B limits of all monotone sequences, iterate this operation until stabilization, and get $\mathrm{Cl}(B)$, call it the closure of B. (It is not a noise-type Boolean algebra, unless B is classical.)

1d2 Theorem. Let B and $\mathrm{Cl}(B)$ be as in Theorem 1d1, and

$$C = \{ x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B) : \exists y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B) \;\; x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda,\, x \vee y = 1_\Lambda \}$$

(the set of all complemented elements of $\mathrm{Cl}(B)$). Then

(a) C is a noise-type Boolean algebra such that $B \subset C \subset \mathrm{Cl}(B)$;

(b) C contains every noise-type Boolean algebra C_1 satisfying $B \subset C_1 \subset \mathrm{Cl}(B)$.

1d3 Definition. The noise-type Boolean algebra C of Theorem 1d2 is called the *noise-type completion* of a noise-type Boolean algebra B.

If two noise-type Boolean algebras have the same closure then clearly they have the same completion.

1d4 Proposition. If two noise-type Boolean algebras have the same closure then they have the same first chaos space.

Thus, if $\mathrm{Cl}(B_1) = \mathrm{Cl}(B_2)$ then classicality of B_1 is equivalent to classicality of B_2, and blackness of B_1 is equivalent to blackness of B_2.

1d5 Question. It follows from Theorem 1d1 that the following conditions are equivalent: $\mathrm{Cl}(B)$ is a lattice; $\mathrm{Cl}(B)$ is a complete lattice; $x \vee y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ for all $x, y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$. These conditions are satisfied by every classical B. Are they satisfied by some nonclassical B? By all nonclassical B?

1e On sufficient subalgebras and black noises

Let B, B_0 be noise-type Boolean algebras such that $B_0 \subset B$. Clearly, $\mathrm{Cl}(B_0) \subset \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ and $H^{(1)}(B_0) \supset H^{(1)}(B)$. We say that

- B_0 is dense in B if $\mathrm{Cl}(B_0) = \mathrm{Cl}(B)$,
- B_0 is sufficient in B if $H^{(1)}(B_0) = H^{(1)}(B)$.

If B_0 is sufficient in B then clearly, classicality of B_0 is equivalent to classicality of B, and blackness of B_0 is equivalent to blackness of B.

A dense subalgebra is sufficient by Prop. 1d4. Surprisingly, a non-dense subalgebra can be sufficient.

1e1 Definition. A noise-type Boolean algebra B is *atomless,* if

$$\inf_{x \in F} x = 0_\Lambda$$

for every ultrafilter $F \subset B$.

See also [19, Def. 1.6]. Recall that a set $F \subset B$ is called a filter if for all $x, y \in B$

$$\begin{gathered} x \in F\,,\ x \le y \quad \Longrightarrow \quad y \in F\,, \\ x, y \in F \quad \Longrightarrow \quad x \wedge y \in F\,, \\ 0_\Lambda \notin F\,; \end{gathered}$$

a filter F is called ultrafilter if it is a maximal filter; equivalently, if

$$\forall x \in B \quad (\, x \notin F \implies x' \in F\,)\,.$$

1e2 Theorem. If a noise-type subalgebra is atomless then it is sufficient.

Every noise over $\mathbb{R}$ (as defined in [18, Def. 3d1]) leads to an atomless noise-type Boolean algebra (see [18, 3d5]). The noise of percolation is a black noise over $\mathbb{R}^2$; restricting it to two-dimensional domains of the form $(a,b)\times\mathbb{R}$ we get a noise over $\mathbb{R}$, black by Theorem 1e2. In this case domains of the form $\mathbb{R}\times(a,b)$ give the same due to isotropy of the noise. In other cases, however, different directions may give nonisomorphic noises over $\mathbb{R}$, and so, Theorem 1e2 may be used for transferring blackness (or classicality) from one direction to all others. In particular, it applies to the Brownian web, see [18, Sect. 7f] and [6].

2 Preliminaries

This section is a collection of useful facts (mostly folk-lore, I guess) more general than noise-type Boolean algebras.

Throughout, the probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},P)$, the complete lattice Λ of sub-σ-fields and the separable Hilbert space $H = L_2(\Omega,\mathcal{F},P)$ are as in Sect. 1a. Complex numbers are not used; H is a Hilbert space over $\mathbb{R}$. A "subspace" of H always means a closed linear subset. Recall also $0_\Lambda, 1_\Lambda, x\wedge y, x\vee y$ for $x,y\in\Lambda$, the notion of independent σ-fields, operators $\mathbb{E}\big(\cdot\,\big|\,x\big)$ of conditional expectation, and $\inf X, \sup X\in\Lambda$ for $X\subset\Lambda$ (Sect. 1a).

2a Type L_2 subspaces

2a1 Fact. ([14, Th. 3]) The following two conditions on a subspace H_1 of H are equivalent:

(a) there exists a sub-σ-field $x\in\Lambda$ such that $H_1 = L_2(x)$, the space of all x-measurable functions of H;

(b) H_1 is a sublattice of H, containing constants. That is, H_1 contains $f\vee g$ and $f\wedge g$ for all $f,g\in H_1$, where $(f\vee g)(\omega) = \max\big(f(\omega),g(\omega)\big)$ and $(f\wedge g)(\omega) = \min\big(f(\omega),g(\omega)\big)$; and H_1 contains the one-dimensional space of constant functions.

Hint to the proof that (b) $\Longrightarrow$ (a): $\mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(f) = \lim_n\big((0\vee nf)\wedge 1\big)\in H_1$ for $f\in H_1$. $\square$

Such subspaces H_1 will be called type L_2 (sub)spaces. (In [14] they are called measurable, which can be confusing.)

Due to linearity of H_1 the condition $f\vee g, f\wedge g\in H_1$ boils down to $|f|\in H_1$ for all $f\in H_1$. (Hint: $f\vee g = f + \big(0\vee(g-f)\big)$, and $0\vee f = 0.5(f+|f|)$.)

2a2 Fact. If $A \subset L_\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ is a subalgebra containing constants then the closure of A in H is a type L_2 space.

("Subalgebra" means $fg \in A$ for all $f, g \in A$, in addition to linearity.)

Hint: approximating the absolute value by polynomials we get $|f| \in H_1$ (the closure of A) for $f \in A$, and by continuity, for $f \in H_1$. $\Box$

2a3 Notation. We denote the type L_2 space $L_2(x)$ corresponding to $x \in \Lambda$ by H_x, and the orthogonal projection $\mathbb{E}\big(\cdot \big| x\big)$ by Q_x. In particular, $H_0 = \{c\mathbb{1} : c \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is the one-dimensional subspace of constant functions on Ω, and $Q_0 f = (\mathbb{E}\, f)\mathbb{1} = \langle f, \mathbb{1}\rangle \mathbb{1}$. Also, $H_1 = H$, and $Q_1 = I$ is the identity operator.

Thus,

$$H_x \subset H\,; \quad Q_x : H \to H\,; \quad Q_x H = H_x \quad \text{for } x \in \Lambda\,; \tag{2a4}$$

$$H_x \subset H_y \iff Q_x \le Q_y \iff x \le y\,; \tag{2a5}$$

$$Q_x Q_y = Q_x = Q_y Q_x \quad \text{whenever } x \le y\,; \tag{2a6}$$

$$H_x = H_y \iff Q_x = Q_y \iff x = y\,; \tag{2a7}$$

$$H_{x \wedge y} = H_x \cap H_y\,; \tag{2a8}$$

(2a6) and (2a7) follow from (2a5); (2a8) is a special case of 2a9.

2a9 Fact. $H_{\inf X} = \bigcap_{x \in X} H_x$ for $X \subset \Lambda$.

Hint: measurability w.r.t. the intersection of σ-fields is equivalent to measurability w.r.t. each one of these σ-fields. $\Box$

However, $H_{x \vee y}$ is generally much larger than the closure of $H_x + H_y$.

2a10 Fact. $H_{x \vee y}$ is the subspace spanned by pointwise products fg for $f \in H_x \cap L_\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ and $g \in H_y \cap L_\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$.

Hint: linear combinations of these products are an algebra; by 2a2 its closure is H_z for some $z \in \Lambda$; note that $z \ge x$, $z \ge y$, but also $z \le x \vee y$. $\Box$

2a11 Fact. Let $x, x_1, x_2, \dots \in \Lambda$, $x_1 \le x_2 \le \dots$ and $x = \sup_n x_n$. Then H_x is the closure of $H_{x_1} \cup H_{x_2} \cup \dots$

Hint: by 2a1, the closure of $\bigcup_n H_{x_n}$ is H_z for some $z \in \Lambda$; note that $z \ge x_n$ for all n, but also $z \le x$. $\Box$

That is,

$$x_n \uparrow x \implies H_{x_n} \uparrow H_x\,; \tag{2a12}$$

$$x_n \downarrow x \implies H_{x_n} \downarrow H_x \tag{2a13}$$

(the latter holds by 2a9).

2b Strong operator convergence

Let H be a Hilbert space and $A, A_1, A_2, \dots : H \to H$ operators (linear, bounded). Strong operator convergence of A_n to A is defined by

$$(A_n \to A) \iff (\forall \psi \in H \ \ \|A_n\psi - A\psi\| \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0) \, .$$

We write just $A_n \to A$, since we do not need other types of convergence for operators.

2b1 Fact. ([11, 2.2.11]) $A_n \to A$ if and only if $\|A_n\psi - A\psi\| \to 0$ for a dense set of vectors ψ and $\sup_n \|A_n\| < \infty$.

2b2 Fact. ([10, Problem 93]; [11, 4.6.1]) If $A_n \to A$ and $B_n \to B$ then $A_n B_n \to AB$.

2b3 Fact. If $A_n \to A$, $B_n \to B$ and $A_n B_n = B_n A_n$ for all n, then $AB = BA$.

HINT: use 2b2. ☐

The following fact allows us to write $A_n \uparrow A$ (or $A_n \downarrow A$) unambiguously. We need it only for commuting orthogonal projections.

2b4 Fact. ([3, 43.1]) Let $A, A_1, A_2, \dots : H \to H$ be Hermitian operators, $A_1 \le A_2 \le \dots$, then

$$A = \sup_n A_n \iff A_n \to A \, .$$

The natural bijective correspondence between subspaces of H and orthogonal projections $H \to H$ is order preserving, therefore

$$H_n \downarrow H_\infty \iff Q_n \downarrow Q_\infty \, ; \quad \text{also, } H_n \uparrow H_\infty \iff Q_n \uparrow Q_\infty \tag{2b5}$$

whenever $H_1, H_2, \dots, H_\infty \subset H$ are subspaces and $Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_\infty : H \to H$ the corresponding orthogonal projections.

In combination with (2a12), (2a13) it gives

$$x_n \downarrow x \text{ implies } Q_{x_n} \downarrow Q_x \, ; \quad \text{also, } x_n \uparrow x \text{ implies } Q_{x_n} \uparrow Q_x \, . \tag{2b6}$$

Let H_1, H_2 be Hilbert spaces, and $H = H_1 \otimes H_2$ their tensor product.

2b7 Fact. Let $A, A_1, A_2, \dots : H_1 \to H_1$, $B, B_1, B_2, \dots : H_2 \to H_2$. If $A_n \to A$ and $B_n \to B$ then $A_n \otimes B_n \to A \otimes B$.

HINT: the operators are uniformly bounded, and converge on a dense set. ☐

2c Independence and tensor products

2c1 Fact. If $x, y \in \Lambda$ are independent then $H_{x \vee y} = H_x \otimes H_y$ up to the natural unitary equivalence:

$$H_x \otimes H_y \ni f \otimes g \longleftrightarrow fg \in H_{x \vee y} \, .$$

Hint: by the independence, $\langle f_1 g_1, f_2 g_2 \rangle = \mathbb{E}\,(f_1 g_1 f_2 g_2) = \mathbb{E}\,(f_1 f_2) \mathbb{E}\,(g_1 g_2) = \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle \langle g_1, g_2 \rangle = \langle f_1 \otimes g_1, f_2 \otimes g_2 \rangle$, thus, $H_x \otimes H_y$ is isometrically embedded into $H_{x \vee y}$; by 2a10 the embedding is "onto". ☐

It may be puzzling that H_x is both a subspace of H and a tensor factor of H (which never happens in the general theory of Hilbert spaces). Here is an explanation. All spaces H_x contain the one-dimensional space H_0 of constant functions (on Ω). Multiplying an x-measurable function $f \in H_x$ by the constant function $g \in H_{x'}$, $g(\cdot) = 1$, we get the (puzzling) equality $f \otimes g = f$.

2c2 Notation. For $u, x \in \Lambda$ such that $u \le x$ we denote by $Q_u^{(x)}$ the restriction of Q_u to H_x.

Thus,

$$Q_u^{(x)} : H_x \to H_x \, , \quad Q_u^{(x)} H_x = H_u \qquad \text{for } u \le x \, .$$

2c3 Fact. If $x, y \in \Lambda$ are independent, $u \le x$, $v \le y$ then, treating $H_{x \vee y}$ as $H_x \otimes H_y$, we have

$$Q_{u \vee v} = Q_u^{(x)} \otimes Q_v^{(y)} \, .$$

Hint: by 2c1, $H_{u \vee v} = H_u \otimes H_v$, and this factorization may be treated as embedded into the factorization $H_{x \vee y} = H_x \otimes H_y$; the projection onto $H_u \otimes H_v \subset H_x \otimes H_y$ factorizes. ☐

In a more probabilistic language,

$$\mathbb{E}\big(fg \big| u \vee v \big) = \mathbb{E}\big(f \big| u \big) \mathbb{E}\big(g \big| v \big) \quad \text{for } f \in L_2(x), \, g \in L_2(y) \, .$$

Here is a very general fact (no σ-fields, no tensor products, just Hilbert spaces).

2c4 Fact. ([10, Problem 96], [3, Exercise 45.4]) Let Q_1, Q_2 be orthogonal projections in a Hilbert space H. Then $(Q_1 Q_2)^n$ converges strongly (as $n \to \infty$) to the orthogonal projection onto $(Q_1 H) \cap (Q_2 H)$.

2c5 Fact. $(Q_x Q_y)^n \to Q_{x \wedge y}$ strongly (as $n \to \infty$) whenever $x, y \in \Lambda$.

Hint: $(Q_x H) \cap (Q_y H) = Q_{x \wedge y} H$ by (2a8); use 2c4. ☐

2c6 Fact. $(Q^{(x)}_{u_1} Q^{(x)}_{u_2})^n \to Q^{(x)}_{u_1 \wedge u_2}$ strongly (as $n \to \infty$) whenever $u_1, u_2 \le x$.

HINT: similar to 2c5. $\square$

2c7 Fact. If $x, y \in \Lambda$ are independent, $u_1, u_2 \le x$ and $v_1, v_2 \le y$ then

$$(u_1 \vee v_1) \wedge (u_2 \vee v_2) = (u_1 \wedge u_2) \vee (v_1 \wedge v_2) \, .$$

HINT: By 2c5, $(Q_{u_1 \vee v_1} Q_{u_2 \vee v_2})^n \to Q_{(u_1 \vee v_1) \wedge (u_2 \vee v_2)}$. By 2c6, $(Q^{(x)}_{u_1} Q^{(x)}_{u_2})^n \to Q^{(x)}_{u_1 \wedge u_2}$ and $(Q^{(y)}_{v_1} Q^{(y)}_{v_2})^n \to Q^{(y)}_{v_1 \wedge v_2}$. By 2c3, $Q_{u_1 \vee v_1} Q_{u_2 \vee v_2} = (Q^{(x)}_{u_1} \otimes Q^{(y)}_{v_1})(Q^{(x)}_{u_2} \otimes Q^{(y)}_{v_2}) = (Q^{(x)}_{u_1} Q^{(x)}_{u_2}) \otimes (Q^{(y)}_{v_1} Q^{(y)}_{v_2})$ and $Q_{(u_1 \wedge u_2) \vee (v_1 \wedge v_2)} = Q^{(x)}_{u_1 \wedge u_2} \otimes Q^{(y)}_{v_1 \wedge v_2}$; use (2a7). $\square$

Remark. In a distributive lattice the equality stated by 2c7 is easy to check (assuming $x \wedge y = 0$ instead of independence). However, the lattice Λ is not distributive.

Useful special cases of 2c7 (assuming that x, y are independent, $u \le x$ and $v \le y$):

$$(u \vee v) \wedge x = u \, , \quad (u \vee v) \wedge y = v \, ; \tag{2c8}$$

$$(u \vee y) \wedge (x \vee v) = u \vee v \, . \tag{2c9}$$

Here is another very general fact (no σ-fields, no tensor products, just random variables).

2c10 Fact. Let $X, X_1, X_2, \dots$ and $Y, Y_1, Y_2, \dots$ are random variables (on a given probability space), and for every n the two random variables X_n, Y_n are independent; if $X_n \to X$, $Y_n \to Y$ in probability then X, Y are independent.

HINT: if $f, g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are bounded continuous functions then $\mathbb{E}\,(f(X_n)) \to \mathbb{E}\,(f(X))$, $\mathbb{E}\,(g(Y_n)) \to \mathbb{E}\,(g(Y))$, $\mathbb{E}\,(f(X_n)) \mathbb{E}\,(g(Y_n)) = \mathbb{E}\,(f(X_n) g(Y_n)) \to \mathbb{E}\,(f(X) g(Y))$, thus, $\mathbb{E}\,(f(X) g(Y)) = \mathbb{E}\,(f(X)) \mathbb{E}\,(g(Y))$. $\square$

The same holds for vector-valued random variables.

2d Measure class spaces and commutative von Neumann algebras

See [5], [15] or [3] for basics about von Neumann algebras; we need only the commutative case.

2d1 Fact. ([5, Sect. I.7.3], [15, Th. 1.22], [11, E4.7.2]) Every commutative von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}$ of operators on a separable Hilbert space H is isomorphic to the algebra $L_\infty(S, \Sigma, \mu)$ on some measure space (S, Σ, μ).

Here and henceforth all measures are positive, finite and such that the corresponding L_2 spaces are separable. The isomorphism $\alpha : \mathcal{A} \to L_\infty(S, \Sigma, \mu)$ preserves linear operations, multiplication and norm. Hermitian operators of $\mathcal{A}$ correspond to real-valued functions of L_∞; we restrict ourselves to these and observe an order isomorphism:

$$A \le B \iff \alpha(A) \le \alpha(B) \,; \quad A = \sup_n A_n \iff \alpha(A) = \sup_n \alpha(A_n) \,. \tag{2d2}$$

2d3 Fact. ([5, Sect. I.4.3, Corollary 1], [3, Sect. 46, Prop. 46.6 and Exercise 1]) Every isomorphism of von Neumann algebras preserves the strong operator convergence (of sequences, not nets).

The measure μ may be replaced with any equivalent (that is, mutually absolutely continuous) measure μ_1. Thus we may turn to a measure class space (see [2, Sect. 14.4]) $(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M})$ where $\mathcal{M}$ is an equivalence class of measures, and write $L_\infty(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M})$; we have an isomorphism

$$\alpha : \mathcal{A} \to L_\infty(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M}) \tag{2d4}$$

of von Neumann algebras. (See [2, 14.4] for the Hilbert space $L_2(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M})$ on which $L_\infty(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M})$ acts by multiplication.)

2d5 Fact. Let $\mathcal{A}$ and α be as in (2d4), $A, A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{A}$, $\sup_n \|A_n\| < \infty$. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:
(a) $A_n \to A$ in the strong operator topology;
(b) $\alpha(A_n) \to \alpha(A)$ in measure.

Hint: ($A_n \to A$ strongly) $\iff$ ($\alpha(A_n) \to \alpha(A)$ strongly) $\iff$ ($\|\alpha(A_n)f - \alpha(A)f\|_2 \to 0$ for every bounded f) $\iff$ ($\alpha(A_n) \to \alpha(A)$ in measure). ☐

Let $\Sigma_1 \subset \Sigma$ be a sub-σ-field. Restrictions $\mu|_{\Sigma_1}$ of measures $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ are mutually equivalent; denoting their equivalence class by $\mathcal{M}|_{\Sigma_1}$ we get a measure class space $(S, \Sigma_1, \mathcal{M}|_{\Sigma_1})$. Clearly, $L_\infty(S, \Sigma_1, \mathcal{M}|_{\Sigma_1}) \subset L_\infty(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M})$ or, in shorter notation, $L_\infty(\Sigma_1) \subset L_\infty(\Sigma)$; this is also a von Neumann algebra.

2d6 Fact. Every von Neumann subalgebra of $L_\infty(\Sigma)$ is $L_\infty(\Sigma_1)$ for some sub-σ-field $\Sigma_1 \subset \Sigma$.

Hint: similar to 2a2. ☐

We have $L_\infty(\Sigma_1) = \alpha(\mathcal{A}_1)$ where $\mathcal{A}_1 = \alpha^{-1}(L_\infty(\Sigma_1)) \subset \mathcal{A}$ is a von Neumann algebra. And conversely, if $\mathcal{A}_1 \subset \mathcal{A}$ is a von Neumann algebra then $\alpha(\mathcal{A}_1) = L_\infty(\Sigma_1)$ for some sub-σ-field $\Sigma_1 \subset \Sigma$.

Given two von Neumann algebras $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2 \subset \mathcal{A}$, we denote by $\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2$ the von Neumann algebra generated by $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$. Similarly, for two σ-fields $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \subset \Sigma$ we denote by $\Sigma_1 \vee \Sigma_2$ the σ-field generated by Σ_1, Σ_2.

2d7 Fact. $L_\infty(\Sigma_1) \vee L_\infty(\Sigma_2) = L_\infty(\Sigma_1 \vee \Sigma_2)$.

HINT: By 2d6, $L_\infty(\Sigma_1) \vee L_\infty(\Sigma_2) = L_\infty(\Sigma_3)$ for some Σ_3; note that $\Sigma_3 \supset \Sigma_1$, $\Sigma_3 \supset \Sigma_2$, but also $\Sigma_3 \subset \Sigma_1 \vee \Sigma_2$. $\square$

2d8 Fact. If $\alpha(\mathcal{A}_1) = L_\infty(\Sigma_1)$ and $\alpha(\mathcal{A}_2) = L_\infty(\Sigma_2)$ then $\alpha(\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2) = L_\infty(\Sigma_1 \vee \Sigma_2)$.

HINT: $\alpha(\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2) = \alpha(\mathcal{A}_1) \vee \alpha(\mathcal{A}_2)$, since α is an isomorphism; use 2d7. $\square$

2d9 Definition. Let $(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M})$ be a measure class space. Two sub-σ-fields $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \subset \Sigma$ are *$\mathcal{M}$-independent*, if they are μ-independent for some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, that is, $\mu(X \cap Y)\mu(S) = \mu(X)\mu(Y)$ for all $X \in \Sigma_1$, $Y \in \Sigma_2$.

2d10 Fact. If σ-fields $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \subset \Sigma$ are independent then $L_\infty(\Sigma_1 \vee \Sigma_2) = L_\infty(\Sigma_1) \otimes L_\infty(\Sigma_2)$ up to the natural isomorphism:

$$L_\infty(\Sigma_1) \otimes L_\infty(\Sigma_2) \ni f \otimes g \longleftrightarrow fg \in L_\infty(\Sigma_1 \vee \Sigma_2)\,.$$

HINT: recall 2c1. $\square$

The product $(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M}) = (S_1, \Sigma_1, \mathcal{M}_1) \times (S_2, \Sigma_2, \mathcal{M}_2)$ of two measure class spaces is a measure class space [2, 14.4]; namely, $(S, \Sigma) = (S_1, \Sigma_1) \times (S_2, \Sigma_2)$, and $\mathcal{M}$ is the equivalence class containing $\mu_1 \times \mu_2$ for some (therefore all) $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$, $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_2$. In this case $L_\infty(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M}) = L_\infty(S_1, \Sigma_1, \mathcal{M}_1) \otimes L_\infty(S_2, \Sigma_2, \mathcal{M}_2)$.

Given two commutative von Neumann algebras $\mathcal{A}_1$ on H_1 and $\mathcal{A}_2$ on H_2, their tensor product $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$ is a von Neumann algebra on $H = H_1 \otimes H_2$. Given isomorphisms $\alpha_1 : \mathcal{A}_1 \to L_\infty(S_1, \Sigma_1, \mathcal{M}_1)$ and $\alpha_2 : \mathcal{A}_2 \to L_\infty(S_2, \Sigma_2, \mathcal{M}_2)$, we get an isomorphism $\alpha = \alpha_1 \otimes \alpha_2 : \mathcal{A} \to L_\infty(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M})$, where $(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M}) = (S_1, \Sigma_1, \mathcal{M}_1) \times (S_2, \Sigma_2, \mathcal{M}_2)$; namely, $\alpha(A_1 \otimes A_2) = \alpha_1(A_1) \otimes \alpha_2(A_2)$ for $A_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$, $A_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2$. Note that $\alpha(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes I) = L_\infty(\tilde\Sigma_1)$ and $\alpha(I \otimes \mathcal{A}_2) = L_\infty(\tilde\Sigma_2)$, where $\tilde\Sigma_1 = \{A_1 \times S_2 : A_1 \in \Sigma_1\}$ and $\tilde\Sigma_2 = \{S_1 \times A_2 : A_2 \in \Sigma_2\}$ are $\mathcal{M}$-independent sub-σ-fields of Σ, and $\tilde\Sigma_1 \vee \tilde\Sigma_2 = \Sigma$.

2d11 Fact. For every isomorphism $\alpha : \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2 \to L_2(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M})$ there exist $\mathcal{M}$-independent $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \subset \Sigma$ such that $\alpha(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes I) = L_\infty(\Sigma_1)$, $\alpha(I \otimes \mathcal{A}_2) = L_\infty(\Sigma_2)$, and $\Sigma_1 \vee \Sigma_2 = \Sigma$.

HINT: we get Σ_1, Σ_2 from 2d6; $\Sigma_1 \vee \Sigma_2 = \Sigma$ by 2d7; for proving independence we choose $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$, $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_2$, take isomorphisms $\alpha_1 : \mathcal{A}_1 \to L_\infty(S_1, \Sigma'_1, \mathcal{M}_1)$, $\alpha_2 : \mathcal{A}_2 \to L_\infty(S_2, \Sigma'_2, \mathcal{M}_2)$ and use the isomorphism $\beta = (\alpha_1 \otimes \alpha_2)\alpha^{-1} : L_\infty(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M}) \to L_\infty\big((S_1, \Sigma'_1, \mathcal{M}_1) \times (S_2, \Sigma'_2, \mathcal{M}_2)\big)$ for defining $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ by $\int f \,\mathrm{d}\mu = \int (\beta f) \,\mathrm{d}(\mu_1 \times \mu_2)$; then Σ_1, Σ_2 are μ-independent. $\square$

Given an isomorphism $\alpha : \mathcal{A} \to L_\infty(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M})$ of von Neumann algebras, we have subspaces $H(E)$, for $E \in \Sigma$, of the space H on which acts $\mathcal{A}$:

$$\begin{gathered} H(E) = \alpha^{-1}(\mathbb{1}_E) H \subset H\,; \\ H(E_1 \cap E_2) = H(E_1) \cap H(E_2)\,, \\ H(E_1 \uplus E_2) = H(E_1) \oplus H(E_2)\,, \\ H(E_1 \cup E_2) = H(E_1) + H(E_2) \end{gathered} \tag{2d12}$$

(the third line differs from the fourth line by assuming that E_1, E_2 are disjoint and concluding that $H(E_1), H(E_2)$ are orthogonal). By (2d2), (2b5)

$$\begin{gathered} E_n \uparrow E \text{ implies } H(E_n) \uparrow H(E)\,, \\ E_n \downarrow E \text{ implies } H(E_n) \downarrow H(E)\,. \end{gathered} \tag{2d13}$$

2e Boolean algebras

Every finite Boolean algebra b has 2^n elements, where n is the number of the atoms $a_1, \dots, a_n$ of b; these atoms satisfy $a_k \wedge a_l = 0_b$ for $k \ne l$, and $a_1 \vee \dots \vee a_n = 1_b$. All elements of b are of the form

$$a_{i_1} \vee \dots \vee a_{i_k}\,, \quad 1 \le i_1 < \dots < i_k \le n\,. \tag{2e1}$$

We denote by Atoms(b) the set of all atoms of b, and rewrite (2e1) as

$$\forall x \in b \qquad x = \bigvee_{a \in \operatorname{Atoms}(b), a \le x} a\,. \tag{2e2}$$

2e3 Fact. Let B be a Boolean algebra, $b_1, b_2 \subset B$ two finite Boolean subalgebras, and $b \subset B$ the Boolean subalgebra generated by b_1, b_2. Then b is finite. If $a_1 \in \operatorname{Atoms}(b_1)$, $a_2 \in \operatorname{Atoms}(b_2)$ and $a_1 \wedge a_2 \ne 0_B$ then $a_1 \wedge a_2 \in \operatorname{Atoms}(b)$, and all atoms of b are of this form.

HINT: these $a_1 \wedge a_2$ are the atoms of some finite Boolean subalgebra b_3; note that $b_1 \subset b_3$ and $b_2 \subset b_3$, but also $b_3 \subset b$. ☐

2e4 Fact. The following four conditions on a Boolean algebra B are equivalent:

$$\begin{gathered} \sup_n x_n \text{ exists for all } x_1, x_2, \dots \in B\,; \\ \inf_n x_n \text{ exists for all } x_1, x_2, \dots \in B\,; \\ \sup_n x_n \text{ exists for all } x_1, x_2, \dots \in B \text{ satisfying } x_1 \le x_2 \le \dots\,; \\ \inf_n x_n \text{ exists for all } x_1, x_2, \dots \in B \text{ satisfying } x_1 \ge x_2 \ge \dots\,. \end{gathered}$$

HINT: first, $\inf_n x_n = (\sup_n x'_n)'$; second, $\sup_n x_n = \sup_n (x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n)$. □

A Boolean algebra B satisfying these equivalent conditions is called *σ-complete* (in other words, a Boolean σ-algebra).

2e5 Fact. ([9, Sect. 14, Lemma 1]) The following two conditions on a Boolean algebra B are equivalent:

(a) no uncountable subset $X \subset B$ satisfies $x \wedge y = 0_B$ for all $x, y \in B$ ("the *countable chain condition*");

(b) every subset X of B has a countable subset Y such that X and Y have the same set of upper bounds.

2e6 Fact. ([9, Sect. 14, Corollary]) If a σ-complete Boolean algebra satisfies the countable chain condition then it is complete.

HINT: use 2e5(b). □

2f Measurable functions and equivalence classes

Let (S, Σ, μ) be a measure space, $\mu(S) < \infty$. As usual, we often treat equivalence classes of measurable functions on S as just measurable functions, which is harmless as long as only countably many equivalence classes are considered simultaneously. Otherwise, dealing with uncountable sets of equivalence classes, we must be cautious.

All equivalence classes of measurable functions $S \to [0, 1]$ are a complete lattice. Let Z be some set of such classes. If Z is countable then its supremum, $\sup Z$, may be treated naively (as the pointwise supremum of functions). For an uncountable Z we have $\sup Z = \sup Z_0$ for some countable $Z_0 \subset Z$. In particular, the equality holds whenever Z_0 is dense in Z according to the L_1 metric.

The same holds for functions $S \to \{0, 1\}$ or, equivalently, measurable sets. Functions $S \to [0, \infty]$ are also a complete lattice, since $[0, \infty]$ can be transformed into $[0, 1]$ by an increasing bijection.

In the context of (2d12), (2d13) we have

$$H\Big(\inf_{i \in I} E_i\Big) = \bigcap_{i \in I} H(E_i) \tag{2f1}$$

for an arbitrary (not just countable) family of equivalence classes E_i of measurable sets. Similarly,

$$H\Big(\sup_{i \in I} E_i\Big) = \sup_{i \in I} H(E_i)\,, \tag{2f2}$$

the closure of the sum of all $H(E_i)$.

2f3 Fact. For every increasing sequence of measurable functions $f_n : S \to [0, \infty)$ there exist $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ such that almost every $s \in S$ satisfies one of two incompatible conditions:

$$\begin{gathered} \text{either} \quad \lim_n f_n(s) < \infty\,, \\ \text{or} \quad f_{n_k}(s) \ge k \text{ for all } k \text{ large enough} \end{gathered}$$

(here "k large enough" means $k \ge k_0(s)$).

Hint: take n_k such that

$$\sum_k \mu\bigl(\{s : f_{n_k} < k\} \cap \{s : \lim_n f_n(s) = \infty\}\bigr) < \infty\,. \quad \Box$$

All said above holds also for a measure class space $(S, \Sigma, \mathcal{M})$ (see Sect. 2d) in place of the measure space (S, Σ, μ).

3 Convergence of σ-fields and independence

Throughout this section $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P), \Lambda, H$ and Q_x are as in Sect. 2.

3a Definition of the convergence

The strong operator topology on the projection operators Q_x induces a topology on Λ; we call it the strong operator topology on Λ. It is metrizable (since the strong operator topology is metrizable on operators of norm ≤ 1, see [3, Sect. 8, Exercise 1]). Thus, for $x, x_1, x_2, \dots \in \Lambda$,

$$x_n \to x \quad \text{means} \quad \forall f \in H \;\; \|Q_{x_n} f - Q_x f\| \to 0\,.$$

On the other hand we have the monotone convergence derived from the partial order on Λ:

$$\begin{gathered} x_n \downarrow x \quad \text{means} \quad x_1 \ge x_2 \ge \dots \text{ and } \inf_n x_n = x\,, \\ x_n \uparrow x \quad \text{means} \quad x_1 \le x_2 \le \dots \text{ and } \sup_n x_n = x\,. \end{gathered}$$

By 2b4,

(3a1) $\qquad x_n \downarrow x$ implies $x_n \to x\,;$ $\quad$ also, $x_n \uparrow x$ implies $x_n \to x\,.$

3b Commuting σ-fields

3b1 Definition. Elements $x, y \in \Lambda$ are *commuting,* if $Q_x Q_y = Q_y Q_x$. A subset of Λ is *commutative,* if its elements are pairwise commuting.

By (2a6),

(3b2) every linearly ordered subset of Λ is commutative.

By 2b3,

(3b3) if $x_n \to x$, $y_n \to y$ and x_n, y_n are commuting for all n, then x, y are commuting.

In particular,

(3b4) the closure of a commutative set is commutative.

It follows from 2c5, or just (2a8), that

(3b5) if $x, y \in \Lambda$ are commuting then $Q_x Q_y = Q_{x \wedge y}$.

Recall $\liminf_n x_n$ for $x_n \in \Lambda$ defined in Sect. 1c.

3b6 Lemma. If $x_n \in \Lambda$ are pairwise commuting and $x_n \to x$ then $\liminf_k x_{n_k} = x$ for some $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$

Proof. The commuting projection operators Q_{x_n} generate a commutative von Neumann algebra; by 2d1 this algebra is isomorphic to the algebra L_∞ on some measure space (of finite measure). Denoting the isomorphism by α we have $\alpha(Q_{x_n}) = \mathbb{1}_{E_n}$, $\alpha(Q_x) = \mathbb{1}_E$ (indicators of some measurable sets E_n, E). Using (3b5) we get

$$\alpha(Q_{x_m \wedge x_n}) = \mathbb{1}_{E_m \cap E_n}$$

for all m, n; the same holds for more than two indices.

The strong convergence of operators $Q_{x_n} \to Q_x$ implies by 2d5 convergence in measure of indicators, $\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \to \mathbb{1}_E$. We choose a subsequence convergent almost everywhere, $\mathbb{1}_{E_{n_k}} \to \mathbb{1}_E$, then $\liminf_k \mathbb{1}_{E_{n_k}} = \mathbb{1}_E$, that is,

$$\sup_k \inf_i \mathbb{1}_{E_{n_{k+i}}} = \mathbb{1}_E \, .$$

We have $\alpha(Q_{x_{n_k} \wedge x_{n_{k+1}} \wedge \dots \wedge x_{n_{k+i}}}) = \mathbb{1}_{E_{n_k} \cap E_{n_{k+1}} \cap \dots \cap E_{n_{k+i}}}$, therefore (for $i \to \infty$), $\alpha(Q_{\inf_i x_{n_{k+i}}}) = \inf_i \mathbb{1}_{E_{n_{k+i}}}$, and further (for $k \to \infty$), $\alpha(Q_{\sup_k \inf_i x_{n_{k+i}}}) = \sup_k \inf_i \mathbb{1}_{E_{n_{k+i}}}$. We get $\alpha(Q_{\liminf_k x_{n_k}}) = \liminf_k \mathbb{1}_{E_{n_k}} = \mathbb{1}_E = \alpha(Q_x)$, therefore $\liminf_k x_{n_k} = x$. $\square$

3b7 Proposition. Assume that a set $B \subset \Lambda$ is commutative, and $x \wedge y \in B$ for all $x, y \in B$. Then the set

$$\mathrm{Cl}(B) = \big\{ \liminf_n x_n : x_1, x_2, \dots \in B \big\}$$

(lower limits of all sequences of elements of B) is equal to the topological closure of B.

Proof. On one hand, if $x_n \to x$ then $x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ by 3b6. On the other hand, $\liminf x_n = \sup_n \inf_k x_{n+k}$ belongs to the topological closure by 3a1. $\square$

3b8 Proposition. Let $x_n, y_n, x, y \in \Lambda$, $x_n \to x$, $y_n \to y$, and for each n (separately), x_n, y_n commute. Then $x_n \wedge y_n \to x \wedge y$.

Proof. By (3b3), $Q_x Q_y = Q_y Q_x$. By (3b5), $Q_{x \wedge y} = Q_x Q_y$. Similarly, $Q_{x_n \wedge y_n} = Q_{x_n} Q_{y_n}$. Using 2b2 we get $Q_{x_n \wedge y_n} \to Q_{x \wedge y}$, that is, $x_n \wedge y_n \to x \wedge y$. $\square$

3c Independent σ-fields

3c1 Proposition. The following two conditions on $x, y \in \Lambda$ are equivalent:

(a) x, y are independent;

(b) x, y are commuting, and $x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda$.

Proof. (a) $\Longrightarrow$ (b): independence of x, y implies $\mathbb{E}\big(f \,\big|\, y\big) = \mathbb{E}\, f$ for all $f \in L_2(x)$, that is, $Q_y f = \langle f, 1\!\!1 \rangle 1\!\!1$ for $f \in H_x$, and therefore $Q_y Q_x = Q_0 = Q_x Q_y$; use (3b5).

(b) $\Longrightarrow$ (a): by (3b5), $Q_y Q_x = Q_0 = Q_x Q_y$; thus $Q_y f = \langle f, 1\!\!1 \rangle 1\!\!1$ for $f \in H_x$, and therefore $P(A \cap B) = \langle 1\!\!1_A, 1\!\!1_B \rangle = \langle 1\!\!1_A, Q_y 1\!\!1_B \rangle = \langle Q_y 1\!\!1_A, 1\!\!1_B \rangle = \langle 1\!\!1_A, 1\!\!1 \rangle \langle 1\!\!1, 1\!\!1_B \rangle = P(A) P(B)$ for all $A \in x$, $B \in y$. $\square$

It may happen that $x \wedge y = 0$ but x, y are not commuting. (In particular, it may happen that x, y are independent w.r.t. some measure equivalent to P, but not w.r.t. P.)

3c2 Corollary. If $x_n \to x$, $y_n \to y$, and x_n, y_n are independent for each n (separately), then x, y are independent.

Proof. By 3c1, x_n, y_n are commuting, and $x_n \wedge y_n = 0_\Lambda$. By 3b3, x, y are commuting. By 3b8, $x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda$. By 3c1 (again), x, y are independent. $\square$

3d Product σ-fields

For every $x \in \Lambda$ the triple $(\Omega, x, P|_x)$ is also a probability space, and it may be used similarly to $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$, giving the complete lattice $\Lambda(\Omega, x, P|_x)$, endowed with the topology, etc. This lattice is naturally embedded into Λ,

$$\Lambda(\Omega, x, P|_x) = \{ y \in \Lambda : y \le x \} \, .$$

The lattice operations $(\wedge, \vee)$, defined on $\Lambda(\Omega, x, P|_x)$, do not differ from these induced from Λ (which is evident); also the topology, defined on $\Lambda(\Omega, x, P|_x)$, does not differ from the topology induced from Λ (which follows easily from the equality $Q_y = Q_y^{(x)} Q_x$ for $y \le x$; see 2c2 for $Q_y^{(x)}$). Thus it is correct to define Λ_x, as a lattice and topological space,[1] by

$$\Lambda(\Omega, x, P|_x) = \Lambda_x = \{ y \in \Lambda : y \le x \} \subset \Lambda \, .$$

Given $x, y \in \Lambda$, the product set $\Lambda_x \times \Lambda_y$ carries the product topology and the product partial order, and is again a lattice (see [4, Sect. 2.15] for the product of two lattices), moreover, a complete lattice (see [4, Exercise 2.26(ii)]).

On the other hand, for independent $x, y \in \Lambda$ we introduce

$$\Lambda_{x,y} = \{ u \vee v : u \le x, v \le y \} \subset \Lambda_{x \vee y} \, .$$

Generally, $\Lambda_{x,y}$ is only a small part of $\Lambda_{x \vee y}$; indeed, a sub-σ-field on the product of two probability spaces is generally not a product of two sub-σ-fields. This fact is a manifestation of nondistributivity of the lattice Λ; the equality

$$(x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge z$$

fails whenever $z \in \Lambda_{x \vee y} \setminus \Lambda_{x,y}$.

3d1 Lemma. Every element of $\Lambda_{x,y}$ is commuting with x (and y).

Proof. By 2c3, treating $H_{x \vee y}$ as $H_x \otimes H_y$ we have $Q_{u \vee v} = Q_u^{(x)} \otimes Q_v^{(y)}$ whenever $u \le x$, $v \le y$. Also, $Q_x = Q_x^{(x)} \otimes Q_0^{(y)}$. By (3b2), $Q_u^{(x)}$ and $Q_x^{(x)}$ are commuting; the same holds for $Q_v^{(y)}$ and $Q_0^{(y)}$. Therefore $Q_{u \vee v}$ and Q_x are commuting. $\square$

3d2 Theorem. If $x, y \in \Lambda$ are independent then $\Lambda_{x,y}$ is a closed subset of Λ, the maps

$$\Lambda_x \times \Lambda_y \ni (u, v) \mapsto u \vee v \in \Lambda_{x,y} \, ,$$
$$\Lambda_{x,y} \ni z \mapsto (x \wedge z, y \wedge z) \in \Lambda_x \times \Lambda_y$$

---

[1] Not "topological lattice", since the lattice operations are generally not continuous.

are mutually inverse bijections, and each of them is both an isomorphism of lattices and a homeomorphism of topological spaces.

PROOF. The composition map $\Lambda_x \times \Lambda_y \to \Lambda_{x,y} \to \Lambda_x \times \Lambda_y$ is the identity by (2c8). Taking into account that the map $\Lambda_x \times \Lambda_y \to \Lambda_{x,y}$ is surjective we get mutually inverse bijections.

The map $\Lambda_x \times \Lambda_y \to \Lambda_{x,y}$ preserves lattice operations: "$\wedge$" by 2c7, and "$\vee$" trivially. It is a bijective homomorphism, therefore, isomorphism of lattices.

Let $u, u_1, u_2, \dots \in \Lambda_x$, $u_n \to u$, and $v, v_1, v_2, \dots \in \Lambda_y$, $v_n \to v$. Then $Q^{(x)}_{u_n} \to Q^{(x)}_u$ and $Q^{(y)}_{v_n} \to Q^{(y)}_v$. By 2b7, $Q^{(x)}_{u_n} \otimes Q^{(y)}_{v_n} \to Q^{(x)}_u \otimes Q^{(y)}_v$. By 2c3, $Q_{u_n \vee v_n} \to Q_{u \vee v}$, that is, $u_n \vee v_n \to u \vee v$. The map $\Lambda_x \times \Lambda_y \to \Lambda_{x,y}$ is thus continuous.

Let $z_1, z_2, \dots \in \Lambda_{x,y}$, $z_n \to z \in \Lambda$. By 3d1 and 3b8, $x \wedge z_n \to x \wedge z$. Similarly, $y \wedge z_n \to y \wedge z$. In particular, taking $z \in \Lambda_{x,y}$ we see that the map $\Lambda_{x,y} \to \Lambda_x \times \Lambda_y$ is continuous. In general (for $z \in \Lambda$) we get $z_n = (x \wedge z_n) \vee (y \wedge z_n) \to (x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z)$, therefore $z = (x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z) \in \Lambda_{x,y}$; we see that $\Lambda_{x,y}$ is closed. $\square$

It follows that

$$\Lambda_{x,y} = \{ z \in \Lambda : z = (x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z) \} . \tag{3d3}$$

3d4 Remark. By Theorem 3d2, any relation between elements of $\Lambda_{x,y}$ expressed in terms of lattice operations (and limits) is equivalent to the conjunction of two similar relations "restricted" to x and y. For example, the relation

$$(z_1 \vee z_2) \wedge z_3 = z_4 \vee z_5$$

between $z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, z_5 \in \Lambda_{x,y}$ splits in two; first,

$$((x \wedge z_1) \vee (x \wedge z_2)) \wedge (x \wedge z_3) = (x \wedge z_4) \vee (x \wedge z_5) ,$$

and second, a similar relation with y in place of x.

4 Noise-type completion

Throughout sections 4–7, $B \subset \Lambda$ is a noise-type Boolean algebra (as defined by 1a1); Λ, H and Q_x are as in Sect. 2.

4a The closure; proving Theorem 1d1

By separability of H and 2e6,

(4a1) $$B \text{ satisfies the countable chain condition;}$$

(4a2) $$B \text{ is complete if and only if it is } \sigma\text{-complete.}$$

Recall that every $x \in B$ has its complement $x' \in B$;

$$x \wedge x' = 0_\Lambda \,, \quad x \vee x' = 1_\Lambda \,; \quad x, x' \text{ are independent.}$$

(The complement in B is unique, however, many other independent complements may exist in Λ.)

By distributivity of B, $y = (x \wedge y) \vee (x' \wedge y)$ for all $x, y \in B$; by (3d3),

(4a3) $$B \subset \Lambda_{x,x'} \quad \text{for every } x \in B \,.$$

By 3d1,

(4a4) $$B \text{ is a commutative subset of } \Lambda \,.$$

Recall $\operatorname{Cl}(B)$ introduced in Theorem 1d1; by 3b7,

(4a5)

$$\text{the topological closure of } B \text{ is } \operatorname{Cl}(B) = \bigl\{ \liminf_n x_n : x_1, x_2, \dots \in B \bigr\} \,.$$

Taking into account that $\Lambda_{x,x'}$ is closed by Theorem 3d2 we get from (4a3)

(4a6) $$\operatorname{Cl}(B) \subset \Lambda_{x,x'} \quad \text{for every } x \in B \,.$$

By (4a4) and (3b4),

(4a7) $$\operatorname{Cl}(B) \text{ is a commutative subset of } \Lambda \,.$$

By 3b8,

(4a8) $$x \wedge y \in \operatorname{Cl}(B) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \operatorname{Cl}(B) \,.$$

By (3b5),

(4a9) $$Q_x Q_y = Q_{x \wedge y} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \operatorname{Cl}(B) \,.$$

Proof of Theorem 1d1. If $x_n \in \operatorname{Cl}(B)$ and $x_n \uparrow x$ then $x_n \to x$ by (3a1), therefore $x \in \operatorname{Cl}(B)$, which proves Item (b) of the theorem.

If $x_n \in \operatorname{Cl}(B)$ and $x = \inf_n x_n$ then $x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_n = y_n \in \operatorname{Cl}(B)$ by (4a8) and $y_n \downarrow x$, thus $y_n \to x$ by (3a1) (again) and $x \in \operatorname{Cl}(B)$, which proves Item (a) of the theorem. □

By 3c1 and (4a7), for $x, y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$,

(4a10) $$x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda \text{ if and only if } x, y \text{ are independent.}$$

By 3b8 and (4a7), for $x, x_n, y, y_n \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$,

(4a11) $$\text{if} \quad x_n \to x,\ y_n \to y \quad \text{then} \quad x_n \wedge y_n \to x \wedge y\,.$$

4a12 Remark. In contrast, $x_n \vee y_n$ need not converge to $x \vee y$, even if $x_n \in B$, $x_n \downarrow 0_\Lambda$, $y_n = x'_n$; it may happen that $y_n \uparrow y$, $y \ne 1_\Lambda$. "The phenomenon …tripped up even Kolmogorov and Wiener" [20, Sect. 4.12]. This situation appears already in the (simplest nonclassical) example given in Sect. 1b; there, $x_n = \sigma(\xi_n, \xi_{n+1}, \dots) \downarrow 0_\Lambda$, but $x'_n = \sigma(\xi_1\xi_2, \xi_2\xi_3, \dots, \xi_{n-1}\xi_n) \uparrow \sigma(\xi_1\xi_2, \xi_2\xi_3, \dots) \ne 1_\Lambda$.

On the other hand, if $x_n \in B$, $x_n \to 1_\Lambda$ then necessarily $x'_n \to 0_\Lambda$ (but we do not need this fact).

By Theorem 3d2, for every $z \in B$ the map $x \mapsto x \wedge z$ is a lattice homomorphism $\Lambda_{z,z'} \to \Lambda_z$, thus, $(x \vee y) \wedge z = (x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z)$ for all $x, y \in \Lambda_{z,z'}$; in particular, it holds for all $x, y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ by (4a6). If $x \vee y = 1_\Lambda$ then $z = (x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z)$. If in addition $x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda$ then x, y are independent by (4a10), and $z \in \Lambda_{x,y}$ by (3d3). Thus, $B \subset \Lambda_{x,y}$. By Theorem 3d2 $\Lambda_{x,y}$ is closed, and we conclude.

4a13 Proposition. If $x, y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$, $x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda$, $x \vee y = 1_\Lambda$ then $\mathrm{Cl}(B) \subset \Lambda_{x,y}$.

4a14 Corollary. For every $x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ there exists at most one $y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ such that $x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda$ and $x \vee y = 1_\Lambda$.

Proof. Assume that $y_1, y_2 \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$, $x \wedge y_k = 0_\Lambda$ and $x \vee y_k = 1_\Lambda$ for $k = 1, 2$. By 4a13, $y_2 \in \Lambda_{x,y_1}$, that is, $y_2 = (x \wedge y_2) \vee (y_1 \wedge y_2) = y_1 \wedge y_2$. Similarly, $y_1 = y_2 \wedge y_1$. □

4b The completion; proving Theorem 1d2

Let B and $\mathrm{Cl}(B)$ be as in Sect. 4a, and

$$C = \{ x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B) : \exists y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B) \;\; x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda,\ x \vee y = 1_\Lambda \}$$

as in Theorem 1d2; clearly,

(4b1) $$B \subset C \subset \mathrm{Cl}(B)\,.$$

Taking 4a14 into account, we extend the complement operation, $x \mapsto x'$, from B to C:

$$x' \in C \text{ for } x \in C\,; \quad (x')' = x\,;$$
$$x \wedge x' = 0_\Lambda\,; \quad x \vee x' = 1_\Lambda\,.$$

By (4a10), x, x' are independent; and by 4a13,

$$\forall x \in C \quad \mathrm{Cl}(B) \subset \Lambda_{x,x'}\,. \tag{4b2}$$

4b3 Lemma. For every $x \in C$ the map

$$\mathrm{Cl}(B) \ni y \mapsto x \vee y \in \Lambda$$

is continuous.

Proof. Let $y_n, y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$, $y_n \to y$; we have to prove that $x \vee y_n \to x \vee y$. By (4a11), $x' \wedge y_n \to x' \wedge y$. Applying Theorem 3d2 to $(x, x' \wedge y_n) \in \Lambda_x \times \Lambda_{x'}$ we get $x \vee (x' \wedge y_n) \to x \vee (x' \wedge y)$. It remains to prove that $x \vee (x' \wedge y_n) = x \vee y_n$ and $x \vee (x' \wedge y) = x \vee y$. We prove the latter; the former is similar. Note that $y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B) \subset \Lambda_{x,x'}$ by (4b2). The lattice isomorphism $\Lambda_{x,x'} \to \Lambda_x \times \Lambda_{x'}$ of Theorem 3d2 maps x into $(x, 0)$ and y into $(x \wedge y, x' \wedge y)$; therefore it maps $x \vee y$ into $\big(x \vee (x \wedge y),\, 0 \vee (x' \wedge y)\big) = (x, x' \wedge y)$, which implies $x \vee (x' \wedge y) = x \vee y$. $\square$

4b4 Lemma.

$$\forall x \in C \;\; \forall y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B) \quad x \vee y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)\,.$$

Proof. By 4b3 it is sufficient to consider $y \in B$. Applying 4b3 (again) to $y \in B \subset C$ we see that the map $\mathrm{Cl}(B) \ni z \mapsto y \vee z \in \Lambda$ is continuous. This map sends B into B, therefore it sends $x \in C \subset \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ into $\mathrm{Cl}(B)$. $\square$

4b5 Lemma. For all $x, y \in C$,

$$x \vee y \in C \quad \text{and} \quad (x \vee y)' = x' \wedge y'\,.$$

Proof. By 4b4, $x \vee y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$. By (4a8), $x' \wedge y' \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$. We have to prove that $(x \vee y) \wedge (x' \wedge y') = 0_\Lambda$ and $(x \vee y) \vee (x' \wedge y') = 1_\Lambda$. We do it using 3d4.

First, $x, y, x', y' \in C \subset \mathrm{Cl}(B) \subset \Lambda_{x,x'}$.

Second, we consider $z = (x \vee y) \wedge (x' \wedge y')$ and "restrict" it first to x: $x \wedge z = (x \vee (x \wedge y)) \wedge (0_\Lambda \wedge (x \wedge y')) = 0_\Lambda$, and second, to x': $x' \wedge z = (0_\Lambda \vee (x' \wedge y)) \wedge x' \wedge (x' \wedge y') \le y \wedge y' = 0_\Lambda$. We get $z = 0_\Lambda$, that is, $(x \vee y) \wedge (x' \wedge y') = 0_\Lambda$.

Third, we consider $z = (x \vee y) \vee (x' \wedge y')$ and get $x \wedge z = x \vee (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge x' \wedge y') = x$ and $x' \wedge z = (x' \wedge x) \vee (x' \wedge y) \vee (x' \wedge x' \wedge y') = (x' \wedge y) \vee (x' \wedge y') = x' \wedge (y \vee y') = x'$. Therefore $z = x \vee x' = 1_\Lambda$, that is, $(x \vee y) \vee (x' \wedge y') = 1_\Lambda$. $\square$

In addition, $x \wedge y = (x' \vee y')' \in C$ for all $x, y \in C$, thus C is a sublattice of Λ. The lattice C is distributive, that is, $x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z)$ for all $x, y, z \in C$, since $C \subset \Lambda_{x,x'}$ by (4b1), (4b2), and the map $\Lambda_{x,x'} \ni y \mapsto x \wedge y \in \Lambda_x$ is a lattice homomorphism by Theorem 3d2. Also, $0_\Lambda \in C$, $1_\Lambda \in C$, and each $x \in C$ has a complement x' in C. By (4b1) and (4a10), x, x' are independent for every $x \in C$. Thus, C is a noise-type Boolean algebra satisfying (4b1), which proves Item (a) of Theorem 1d2.

If C_1 is also a noise-type Boolean algebra satisfying $B \subset C_1 \subset \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ then every element of C_1 belongs to C, since its complement in C_1 is also its complement in $\mathrm{Cl}(B)$. Thus, $C_1 \subset C$, which proves Item (b) of Theorem 1d2.

4b6 Corollary. The following two conditions on a noise-type Boolean algebra B are equivalent:

(a) $C = \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ (where C is the completion of B);

(b) there exists a complete noise-type Boolean algebra $\hat{B}$ such that $B \subset \hat{B}$.

Proof. (a) $\Longrightarrow$ (b): the noise-type Boolean algebra $C = \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ is closed; by (3a1) it is σ-complete (recall Sect. 2e); by (4a2) it is complete.

(b) $\Longrightarrow$ (a): Given $x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$, we take $x_n \in B$ such that $x = \liminf_n x_n$ (recall (4a5)); $x \in \hat{B}$. The complement x' of x in $\hat{B}$ belongs to $\mathrm{Cl}(B)$, since $(\liminf_n x_n)' = \limsup_n x'_n$ in $\hat{B}$. Thus, x is complemented in $\mathrm{Cl}(B)$, that is, $x \in C$. ☐

5 Classicality and blackness

5a Atomless algebras

Recall Sect. 1e.

5a1 Proposition. If B is atomless then for every $f \in H$ satisfying $Q_0 f = 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist n and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in B$ such that

$$x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n = 1_\Lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \|Q_{x_1} f\| \le \varepsilon, \dots, \|Q_{x_n} f\| \le \varepsilon \,.$$

The proof is given after three lemmas.

5a2 Lemma. Let $F \subset B$ be a filter such that $\inf_{x \in F} x = 0_\Lambda$. Then $\inf_{x \in F} \|Q_x f\| = 0$ for all $f \in H$ satisfying $Q_0 f = 0$.

PROOF. Given such f, we denote $c = \inf_{x \in F} \|Q_x f\|$, assume that $c > 0$ and seek a contradiction.

We choose $x_n \in F$ such that $x_1 \ge x_2 \ge \dots$ and $\|Q_{x_n} f\| \downarrow c$. Necessarily, $x_n \downarrow x$ for some $x \in \Lambda$; by (2b6), $Q_{x_n} \to Q_x$, thus $\|Q_x f\| = c$.

For arbitrary $y \in F$ we have $\|Q_y Q_{x_n} f\| \ge c$ (since $Q_y Q_{x_n} = Q_{y \wedge x_n}$ by (4a9), and $y \wedge x_n \in F$), therefore $\|Q_y Q_x f\| \ge c = \|Q_x f\|$, which implies $Q_y Q_x f = Q_x f$, that is, $Q_x f \in H_y$ for all $y \in F$. By 2a9, $\bigcap_{y \in F} H_y = H_0$. We get $Q_x f \in H_0$, $Q_0 Q_x f = 0$ and $\|Q_x f\| \ne 0$; a contradiction. $\square$

5a3 Lemma. Let a function $m : B \to [0, \infty)$ satisfy $m(x \vee y) + m(x \wedge y) \ge m(x) + m(y)$ for all $x, y \in B$, and $m(0_\Lambda) = 0$. Then the following two conditions on m are equivalent:

(a) for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist n and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in B$ such that $x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n = 1_\Lambda$ and $m(x_1) \le \varepsilon, \dots, m(x_n) \le \varepsilon$;

(b) $\inf_{x \in F} m(x) = 0$ for every ultrafilter $F \subset B$.

PROOF. (a) $\Longrightarrow$ (b): the ultrafilter must contain at least one x_k, thus $\inf_{x \in F} m(x) \le \varepsilon$ for every ε.

(b) $\Longrightarrow$ (a): we assume that (a) is violated and prove that (b) is violated.

Note that $m(x \vee y) \ge m(x) + m(y) \ge m(x)$ whenever $x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda$, and therefore $m(x) \ge m(y)$ whenever $x \ge y$.

We define $\gamma : B \to [0, \infty)$ by

$$\gamma(x) = \inf_{x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n = x} \max\bigl(m(x_1), \dots, m(x_n)\bigr) ,$$

the infimum being taken over all n and all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in B$ such that $x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n = x$. We denote $c = \gamma(1_\Lambda)$ and note that $c > 0$ (since (a) is violated). Clearly, $\gamma(x) \le m(x)$, and $\gamma(x \vee y) = \max\bigl(\gamma(x), \gamma(y)\bigr)$ for all $x, y \in B$.

Claim: for every $x \in B$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $y \in B$ such that $y \le x$ and $\gamma(x) = \gamma(y) \le m(y) \le \gamma(x) + \varepsilon$. *Proof:* take $x_1, \dots, x_n$ such that $x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n = x$ and $\max_k m(x_k) \le \gamma(x) + \varepsilon$; note that $\gamma(x) = \max_k \gamma(x_k)$, choose k such that $\gamma(x) = \gamma(x_k)$, then $y = x_k$ fits.

Iterating the transition from x to y we construct $x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots \in B$ such that $1_\Lambda = x_0 \ge x_1 \ge x_2 \ge \dots$, $\gamma(x_n) = c$ for all n, and $m(x_n) \downarrow c$ as $n \to \infty$.

We introduce

$$F = \{ y \in B : \lim_n m(x_n \wedge y) \ge c \} = \{ y \in B : m(x_n \wedge y) \downarrow c \}$$

and note that $\inf_{y \in F} m(y) \ge c > 0$ (just because $m(y) \ge m(x_n \wedge y)$). It is sufficient to prove that F is an ultrafilter.

If $y \in F$ and $y \le z$ then $z \in F$ (just because $m(x_n \wedge y) \le m(x_n \wedge z)$).

If $y, z \in F$ then $m(x_n) \ge m\big((x_n \wedge y) \vee (x_n \wedge z)\big) \ge m(x_n \wedge y) + m(x_n \wedge z) - m\big((x_n \wedge y) \wedge (x_n \wedge z)\big)$, therefore $\lim_n m(x_n \wedge y \wedge z) \ge \lim_n m(x_n \wedge y) + \lim_n m(x_n \wedge z) - \lim_n m(x_n) = c$, thus $y \wedge z \in F$. We conclude that F is a filter.

For arbitrary $y \in B$ we have $c = \gamma(x_n) \le \max\big(m(x_n \wedge y), m(x_n \wedge y')\big)$ for all n, thus, $c \le \lim_n \max\big(m(x_n \wedge y), m(x_n \wedge y')\big) = \max\big(\lim_n m(x_n \wedge y), \lim_n m(x_n \wedge y')\big)$, which shows that $y \notin F \implies y' \in F$. We conclude that F is an ultrafilter, which completes the proof. $\square$

5a4 Lemma. $Q_x + Q_y \le Q_{x \vee y} + Q_{x \wedge y}$ for all $x, y \in B$.

PROOF. By (4a4), Q_x and Q_y are commuting projections, which implies $Q_x + Q_y = Q_x \vee Q_y + Q_x \wedge Q_y$, where $Q_x \vee Q_y$ and $Q_x \wedge Q_y$ are projections onto $Q_x H + Q_y H$ and $Q_x H \cap Q_y H$ respectively. Using (4a9), $Q_x \wedge Q_y = Q_x Q_y = Q_{x \wedge y}$. It remains to note that $Q_x \vee Q_y \le Q_{x \vee y}$ just because $Q_x \le Q_{x \vee y}$ and $Q_y \le Q_{x \vee y}$. $\square$

Taking into account that $\|Q_x \psi\|^2 = \langle Q_x \psi, \psi \rangle$ we get

$$\|Q_x f\|^2 + \|Q_y f\|^2 \le \|Q_{x \vee y} f\|^2 + \|Q_{x \wedge y} f\|^2 \tag{5a5}$$

for all $x, y \in B$ and $f \in H$. Thus, the function $m : x \mapsto \|Q_x f\|^2$ satisfies the condition $m(x \vee y) + m(x \wedge y) \ge m(x) + m(y)$ of 5a3; the other condition, $m(0_\Lambda) = 0$, is also satisfied if $Q_0 f = 0$.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5a1. Let $f \in H$, $Q_0 f = 0$. By 5a2, $\inf_{x \in F} \|Q_x f\| = 0$ for every ultrafilter $F \subset B$. It remains to apply 5a3 to $m : x \mapsto \|Q_x f\|^2$. $\square$

5b The first chaos; proving Proposition 1d4

Let C be the completion of B (see Def. 1d3). Recall the first chaos space $H^{(1)}(B) \subset H$ (Def. 1a2).

5b1 Lemma. The following three conditions on $f \in H$ are equivalent:
(a) $f \in H^{(1)}(B)$, that is, $f = Q_x f + Q_{x'} f$ for all $x \in B$;
(b) $Q_{x \vee y} f = Q_x f + Q_y f$ for all $x, y \in B$ satisfying $x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda$;
(c) $Q_{x \vee y} f + Q_{x \wedge y} f = Q_x f + Q_y f$ for all $x, y \in B$, and $Q_0 f = 0$.

PROOF. Condition (a) for $x = 0_\Lambda$ gives $f = Q_0 f + f$, that is, $Q_0 f = 0$. Condition (b) for $x = y = 0_\Lambda$ gives $Q_0 f = Q_0 f + Q_0 f$, that is, $Q_0 f = 0$ (again). Condition (c) requires $Q_0 f = 0$ explicitly. Thus, we restrict ourselves to f satisfying $Q_0 f = 0$.

Clearly, (c) $\implies$ (b) $\implies$ (a); we'll prove that (a) $\implies$ (b) $\implies$ (c). Recall (4a9): $Q_x Q_y = Q_{x \wedge y}$.

(a) $\Longrightarrow$ (b): If $x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda$ then $Q_{x\vee y} f = Q_{x\vee y}(Q_x f + Q_{x'} f) = Q_{x\vee y} Q_x f + Q_{x\vee y} Q_{x'} f = Q_{(x\vee y)\wedge x} f + Q_{(x\vee y)\wedge x'} f = Q_x f + Q_y f$.

(b) $\Longrightarrow$ (c): we apply (b) twice; first, to x and $x' \wedge y$, getting $Q_{x\vee y} f = Q_x f + Q_{x'\wedge y} f$, and second, to $x \wedge y$ and $x' \wedge y$, getting $Q_y f = Q_{x\wedge y} f + Q_{x'\wedge y} f$. It remains to eliminate $Q_{x'\wedge y} f$. ☐

Proof of Proposition 1d4. It is sufficient to prove that $H^{(1)}(B) = H^{(1)}(C)$. The inclusion $H^{(1)}(B) \supset H^{(1)}(C)$ follows readily from the inclusion $B \subset C$. We have to prove that $H^{(1)}(B) \subset H^{(1)}(C)$. Let $f \in H^{(1)}(B)$. By 5b1, $Q_0 f = 0$ and $Q_{x\vee y} f + Q_{x\wedge y} f = Q_x f + Q_y f$ for all $x, y \in B$; it is sufficient to extend this equality to all $x, y \in C$. We do it in two steps: first, we extend it to $x \in B$, $y \in C$ by separate continuity in y for fixed x; and second, we extend it to $x, y \in C$ by separate continuity in x for fixed y. The separate continuity of $x \vee y$ is ensured by 4b3. Continuity of $x \wedge y$ is ensured by (4a11). ☐

From now on we often abbreviate $H^{(1)}(B)$ to $H^{(1)}$.

The space $H^{(1)}$ is invariant under projections Q_x for $x \in B$ and moreover, for $x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ (since for $f \in H^{(1)}$, $x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ and $g = Q_x f$ we have, using (4a7), $Q_y g + Q_{y'} g = (Q_y + Q_{y'}) Q_x f = Q_x (Q_y + Q_{y'}) f = Q_x f = g$ for all $y \in B$). We denote the restriction of Q_x to $H^{(1)}$ by $Q_x^{(1)}$; using (4a9) and 5b1 we have for all $x, y \in B$

(5b2) $$Q_x^{(1)} : H^{(1)} \to H^{(1)} ; \quad Q_x^{(1)} f = Q_x f ; \quad Q_0^{(1)} = 0 , \quad Q_1^{(1)} = I ;$$

(5b3) $$Q_{x\wedge y}^{(1)} = Q_x^{(1)} Q_y^{(1)} ;$$

(5b4) $$Q_{x\vee y}^{(1)} + Q_{x\wedge y}^{(1)} = Q_x^{(1)} + Q_y^{(1)} ;$$

(5b5) $$Q_{x\vee y}^{(1)} = Q_x^{(1)} + Q_y^{(1)} \quad \text{whenever } x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda ;$$

(5b6) $$Q_x^{(1)} + Q_{x'}^{(1)} = I ;$$

here I is the identity operator on $H^{(1)}$.

5c Sufficient subalgebras; proving Theorem 1e2

5c1 Lemma. The following two conditions on $x \in B$ and $f \in H$ are equivalent:

(a) $f = Q_x f + Q_{x'} f$;

(b) $\mathbb{E}\, f = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}\,(fgh) = 0$ for all $g \in H_x$, $h \in H_{x'}$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}\, g = 0$, $\mathbb{E}\, h = 0$.

Proof. Treating H as $H_x \otimes H_{x'}$ according to 2c1 we have $H = \big((H_x \ominus H_0) \oplus H_0\big) \otimes \big((H_{x'} \ominus H_0) \oplus H_0\big) = (H_x \ominus H_0) \otimes (H_{x'} \ominus H_0) \oplus (H_x \ominus H_0) \otimes$

$H_0 \oplus H_0 \otimes (H_{x'} \ominus H_0) \oplus H_0 \otimes H_0$; here $H_x \ominus H_0$ is the orthogonal complement of H_0 in H_x (it consists of all zero-mean functions of H_x). In this notation $Q_x + Q_{x'}$ becomes $I \otimes Q_0^{(x')} + Q_0^{(x)} \otimes I = \big((I - Q_0^{(x)}) + Q_0^{(x)}\big) \otimes Q_0^{(x')} + Q_0^{(x)} \otimes \big((I - Q_0^{(x')}) + Q_0^{(x')}\big) = (I - Q_0^{(x)}) \otimes Q_0^{(x')} + Q_0^{(x)} \otimes (I - Q_0^{(x')}) + 2Q_0^{(x)} \otimes Q_0^{(x')}$, the projection onto $(H_x \ominus H_0) \otimes H_0 \oplus H_0 \otimes (H_{x'} \ominus H_0)$ plus twice the projection onto $H_0 \otimes H_0$ ($= H_0$). Thus, the equality $f = (Q_x + Q_{x'})f$ (Item (a)) becomes $f \in (H_x \ominus H_0) \otimes H_0 \oplus H_0 \otimes (H_{x'} \ominus H_0)$, or equivalently, orthogonality of f to H_0 and $(H_x \ominus H_0) \otimes (H_{x'} \ominus H_0)$, which is Item (b). ☐

5c2 Remark. The proof given above shows also that

$$\{f \in H : f = Q_x f + Q_{x'} f\} = (H_x \ominus H_0) \oplus (H_{x'} \ominus H_0)$$

for all $x \in B$.

Let $B_0 \subset B$ be a noise-type subalgebra, and $f \in H^{(1)}(B_0)$. We say that f is B_0-atomless, if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist n and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in B_0$ such that $x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n = 1_\Lambda$ and $\|Q_{x_1} f\| \le \varepsilon, \dots, \|Q_{x_n} f\| \le \varepsilon$.

5c3 Proposition. If $f \in H^{(1)}(B_0)$ is B_0-atomless then $f \in H^{(1)}(B)$.

PROOF. Given $x \in B$, we have to prove that $f = Q_x f + Q_{x'} f$. Let $g \in H_x \ominus H_0$, $h \in H_{x'} \ominus H_0$; by Lemma 5c1 it is sufficient to prove that $\mathbb{E}\,(fgh) = 0$.

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we take $y_1, \dots, y_n$ in B_0 such that $y_1 \vee \dots \vee y_n = 1_\Lambda$, $\|Q_{y_i} f\| \le \varepsilon$ for all i, and in addition, $y_i \wedge y_j = 0_\Lambda$ whenever $i \ne j$. We have $f = \sum_i Q_{y_i} f$ by 5b1, thus, $\mathbb{E}\,(fgh) = \sum_i \mathbb{E}\,\big((Q_{y_i} f) gh\big)$. Further, $\mathbb{E}\,\big((Q_{y_i} f) gh\big) = \langle Q_{y_i} f, g \otimes h \rangle = \langle Q_{y_i} f, Q_{y_i}(g \otimes h) \rangle = \langle Q_{y_i} f, (Q_{u_i}^{(x)} \otimes Q_{v_i}^{(x')})(g \otimes h) \rangle = \langle Q_{y_i} f, (Q_{u_i}^{(x)} g) \otimes (Q_{v_i}^{(x')} h) \rangle$, where $u_i = y_i \wedge x$ and $v_i = y_i \wedge x'$; it follows that $|\mathbb{E}\,(fgh)| \le \sum_i \|Q_{y_i} f\| \cdot \|Q_{u_i}^{(x)} g\| \cdot \|Q_{v_i}^{(x')} h\|$. By (5a5), $\sum_i \|Q_{u_i}^{(x)} g\|^2 \le \|g\|^2$ and $\sum_i \|Q_{v_i}^{(x')} h\|^2 \le \|h\|^2$. We get $|\mathbb{E}\,(fgh)| \le \big(\max_i \|Q_{y_i} f\|\big)\big(\sum_i \|Q_{u_i}^{(x)} g\| \cdot \|Q_{v_i}^{(x')} h\|\big) \le \varepsilon \|g\| \|h\|$ for all ε. ☐

PROOF OF THEOREM 1e2. Given an atomless noise-type subalgebra $B_0 \subset B$, we have to prove that $H^{(1)}(B_0) \subset H^{(1)}(B)$. Applying Proposition 5a1 to B_0 we see that every $f \in H^{(1)}(B_0)$ is B_0-atomless. By 5c3, $f \in H^{(1)}(B)$. ☐

6 The easy part of Theorem 1c2

6a From (a) to (b)

In this subsection we assume that B is a *classical* noise-type Boolean algebra and prove that its completion, C, is equal to its closure, $\mathrm{Cl}(B)$; in combination with 4b6 it gives the implication (a) $\Longrightarrow$ (b) of Theorem 1c2.

The first chaos space $H^{(1)}$ is invariant under Q_x for $x \in B$ and moreover, for $x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$, as noted in Sect. 5b. We denote by $\mathrm{Down}(x)$, for $x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$, the restriction of Q_x to $H^{(1)}$ (treated as an operator $H^{(1)} \to H^{(1)}$), recall Sect. 5b and note that

$$\mathrm{Down}(x) : H^{(1)} \to H^{(1)} , \quad \mathrm{Down}(x) f = Q_x f \quad \text{for } x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B) ; \tag{6a1}$$

$$\mathrm{Down}(x) = Q_x^{(1)} \text{ for } x \in B; \tag{6a2}$$

$$\mathrm{Down}(x) + \mathrm{Down}(x') = I \quad \text{for } x \in B ; \tag{6a3}$$

$$x \le y \text{ implies } \mathrm{Down}(x) \le \mathrm{Down}(y) \quad \text{for } x, y \in \mathrm{Cl}(B) . \tag{6a4}$$

We denote by $\mathbf{Q}$ the closure of $\{\mathrm{Down}(x) : x \in B\}$ in the strong operator topology; $\mathbf{Q}$ is a closed set of commuting projections on $H^{(1)}$; we have $\mathrm{Down}(x) \in \mathbf{Q}$ for $x \in B$, and by continuity for $x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ as well.

Note that $q \in \mathbf{Q}$ implies $I - q \in \mathbf{Q}$ (since $\mathrm{Down}(x_n) \to q$ implies $\mathrm{Down}(x'_n) \to I - q$ by (6a3)).

For $q \in \mathbf{Q}$ we define $\mathrm{Up}(q) = \sigma(qH^{(1)}) \in \Lambda$ (the σ-field generated by qf for all $f \in H^{(1)}$) and note that

$$q_1 \le q_2 \quad \text{implies} \quad \mathrm{Up}(q_1) \le \mathrm{Up}(q_2) ; \tag{6a5}$$

$$\mathrm{Up}(q) \vee \mathrm{Up}(I - q) = 1_\Lambda \quad \text{for } q \in Q ; \tag{6a6}$$

in general, $\mathrm{Up}(q) \vee \mathrm{Up}(I - q) = \sigma(H^{(1)})$, since $qH^{(1)} + (I - q)H^{(1)} = H^{(1)}$; and the equality $\sigma(H^{(1)}) = 1_\Lambda$ is the classicality (Def. 1a3).

6a7 Lemma. $\mathrm{Up}(q)$ and $\mathrm{Up}(I - q)$ are independent (for each $q \in \mathbf{Q}$).

Proof. We take $x_n \in B$ such that $\mathrm{Down}(x_n) \to q$, then $\mathrm{Down}(x'_n) \to I - q$. We have to prove that $\sigma(qH^{(1)})$ and $\sigma((I - q)H^{(1)})$ are independent, that is, two random vectors $\big(qf_1, \dots, qf_k\big)$ and $\big((I - q)g_1, \dots, (I - q)g_l\big)$ are independent for all k, l and all $f_1, \dots, f_k, g_1, \dots, g_l \in H^{(1)}$. It follows by (2c10) from the similar claim for $\mathrm{Down}(x_n)$ in place of q. ☐

6a8 Lemma. $\mathrm{Up}(\mathrm{Down}(x)) = x$ for every $x \in B$.

Proof. Denote $q = \mathrm{Down}(x)$, then $\mathrm{Down}(x') = I - q$ by (6a3). We have $\mathrm{Up}(q) \le x$ (since $qf = Q_x f$ is x-measurable for $f \in H^{(1)}$); similarly, $\mathrm{Up}(I - q) \le x'$. By (6a6) and (2c8), $\mathrm{Up}(q) = \big(\mathrm{Up}(q) \vee \mathrm{Up}(I - q)\big) \wedge x = x$. ☐

6a9 Lemma. If $q, q_1, q_2, \dots \in \mathbf{Q}$ satisfy $q_n \uparrow q$ then $\mathrm{Up}(q_n) \uparrow \mathrm{Up}(q)$.

Proof. $q_n H^{(1)} \uparrow q H^{(1)}$ implies $\sigma(q_n H^{(1)}) \uparrow \sigma(q H^{(1)})$. ☐

6a10 Lemma. If $q, q_1, q_2, \dots \in \mathbf{Q}$ satisfy $q_n \downarrow q$ then $\mathrm{Up}(q_n) \downarrow \mathrm{Up}(q)$.

PROOF. We have $\mathrm{Up}(q_n) \downarrow x$ for some $x \in \Lambda$, $x \ge \mathrm{Up}(q)$. By 6a7, $\mathrm{Up}(q_n)$ and $\mathrm{Up}(I - q_n)$ are independent; thus, x and $\mathrm{Up}(I - q_n)$ are independent for all n. By 6a9, $\mathrm{Up}(I - q_n) \uparrow \mathrm{Up}(I - q)$. Therefore x and $\mathrm{Up}(I - q)$ are independent. By (6a6) and (2c8), $\mathrm{Up}(q) = \big(\mathrm{Up}(q) \vee \mathrm{Up}(I - q)\big) \wedge x = x$. $\square$

Now we prove that $C = \mathrm{Cl}(B)$. By (4a5), every $x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ is of the form

$$x = \liminf_n x_n = \sup_n \inf_k x_{n+k}$$

for some $x_n \in B$. It follows that $\mathrm{Down}(x) = \liminf_n \mathrm{Down}(x_n)$; by 6a9, 6a10, $\mathrm{Up}(\mathrm{Down}(x)) = \liminf_n \mathrm{Up}(\mathrm{Down}(x_n))$; using 6a8 we get $\mathrm{Up}(\mathrm{Down}(x)) = \liminf_n x_n = x$.

On the other hand, $I - \mathrm{Down}(x) = \limsup_n (I - \mathrm{Down}(x_n)) = \limsup_n \mathrm{Down}(x'_n)$ by (6a3), thus the element $y = \mathrm{Up}(I - \mathrm{Down}(x))$ satisfies (by 6a9, 6a10 and 6a8 again) $y = \limsup_n \mathrm{Up}(\mathrm{Down}(x'_n)) = \limsup_n x'_n \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$.

By 6a7, x and y are independent. By (6a6), $x \vee y = 1_\Lambda$. Therefore, y is the complement of x in $\mathrm{Cl}(B)$, and we conclude that $x \in C$. Thus, $C = \mathrm{Cl}(B)$.

6b From (b) to (c)

As before, C stands for the completion of B. Let $x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ be such that $x_n \uparrow x$ for some $x_n \in B$.

6b1 Proposition. The following five conditions on x are equivalent.

(a) $x \in C$;
(b) $x \vee \lim_n x'_n = 1_\Lambda$ for some $x_n \in B$ satisfying $x_n \uparrow x$;
(c) $x \vee \lim_n x'_n = 1_\Lambda$ for all $x_n \in B$ satisfying $x_n \uparrow x$;
(d) $\lim_m \lim_n (x_m \vee x'_n) = 1_\Lambda$ for some $x_n \in B$ satisfying $x_n \uparrow x$;
(e) $\lim_m \lim_n (x_m \vee x'_n) = 1_\Lambda$ for all $x_n \in B$ satisfying $x_n \uparrow x$.

6b2 Lemma. $(\sup_n x_n) \wedge (\inf_n x'_n) = 0_\Lambda$ for every increasing sequence $(x_n)_n$ of elements of B.

PROOF. Note that $x_m \wedge (\inf_n x'_n) \le x_m \wedge x'_m = 0_\Lambda$ and use (4a11). $\square$

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 6b1. (c) $\Longrightarrow$ (b): trivial.

(b) $\Longrightarrow$ (a): by 6b2, $x \wedge \lim_n x'_n = 0_\Lambda$, thus, x has the complement $\lim_n x'_n$ and therefore belongs to C.

(a) $\Longrightarrow$ (c): if $x_n \uparrow x$ then (taking complements in the Boolean algebra C) $x'_n \ge x'$, therefore $\lim_n x'_n \ge x'$ and $x \vee \lim_n x'_n \ge x \vee x' = 1_\Lambda$.

We see that (a) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (b) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (c); Lemma 6b3 below gives (b) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (d) and (c) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (e). $\square$

6b3 Lemma. For every increasing sequence $(x_n)_n$ of elements of B,

$$\bigl(\lim_n x_n\bigr) \vee \bigl(\lim_n x'_n\bigr) = \lim_m \lim_n (x_m \vee x'_n)\,.$$

PROOF. Denote for convenience $y = \lim_n x_n$ and $z = \lim_n x'_n$. We have $x'_n \le x'_m$ for $n \ge m$. Applying Theorem 3d2 to the pairs $(x_m, x'_n) \in \Lambda_{x_m} \times \Lambda_{x'_m}$ for a fixed m and all $n \ge m$ we get $x_m \vee x'_n \to x_m \vee z$ as $n \to \infty$. Further, $x_m \wedge z \le x_m \wedge x'_m = 0$ for all m; by (4a11), $y \wedge z = 0$, and by (4a10), y and z are independent. Applying Theorem 3d2 (again) to $(x_m, z) \in \Lambda_y \times \Lambda_z$ we get $x_m \vee z \to y \vee z$ as $m \to \infty$. Finally, $\lim_m \lim_n (x_m \vee x'_n) = \lim_m (x_m \vee z) = y \vee z = (\lim_n x_n) \vee (\lim_n x'_n)$. $\square$

By 4b6, Condition (b) of Theorem 1c2 is equivalent to $C = \mathrm{Cl}(B)$. If it is satisfied then 6b1 gives $(\sup_n x_n) \vee (\inf_n x'_n) = 1_\Lambda$ for all $x_n \in B$ such that $x_1 \le x_2 \le \dots$, which is Condition (c) of Theorem 1c2.

7 The difficult part of Theorem 1c2

The proof of the implication (c) $\Longrightarrow$ (a) of Theorem 1c2, given in this section, is a remake of [17, Sect. 6c/6.3]. In both cases spectrum is crucial. The one-dimensional framework used in [17] leads to “spectral sets” — random compact subsets of the parameter space $\mathbb{R}$. The Boolean framework used here, being free of any parameter space, leads to a more abstract “spectral space” (see Sect. 7b). The number of points in a spectral set, used in [17], becomes here a special function (denoted by K in Sect. 7d) on the spectral space.

7a A random supremum

By 6b1, Condition (c) of Theorem 1c2 may be reformulated as follows:

$$\sup_n x_n \in C \quad \text{for all } x_n \in B \text{ such that } x_1 \le x_2 \le \dots \tag{7a1}$$

or equivalently,

$$\lim_m \lim_n \bigl(x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_m \vee (x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n)'\bigr) = 1 \quad \text{for all } x_n \in B\,. \tag{7a2}$$

In order to effectively use this condition we choose a sequence $(x_n)_n$, $x_n \in B$, whose supremum is unlike to belong to C. Ultimately it will be proved that $\sup_n x_n \in C$ only if B is classical.

However, we do not construct $(x_n)_n$ explicitly. Instead we use probabilistic method: construct a random sequence that has the needed property with a non-zero probability.

Our noise-type Boolean algebra B consists of sub-σ-fields on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$. However, randomness of x_n does not mean that x_n is a function on Ω. Another probability space, unrelated to $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$, is involved. It may be thought of as the space of sequences $(x_n)_n$ endowed with a probability measure described below.

Often, "measure on a Boolean algebra b" stands for an additive function $b \to [0, \infty)$. However, the distribution of a random element of b (assuming that b is finite) is rather a probability measure ν on the set of all elements of b, that is, an additive function $\nu : 2^b \to [0, \infty)$, $\nu(b) = 1$. It boils down to a function $b \to [0, \infty)$, $x \mapsto \nu(\{x\})$, such that $\sum_{x \in b} \nu(\{x\}) = 1$.

Given a finite Boolean algebra b and a number $p \in (0, 1)$, we introduce a probability measure $\nu_{b,p}$ on the set of elements of b by

$$\text{(7a3)} \qquad \nu_{b,p}(\{a_{i_1} \vee \dots \vee a_{i_k}\}) = p^k (1-p)^{n-k} \quad \text{for } 1 \le i_1 < \dots < i_k \le n$$

(using the notation of (2e1)). That is, each atom is included with probability p, independently of others.

Given finite Boolean subalgebras $b_1 \subset b_2 \subset \dots \subset B$ and numbers $p_1, p_2, \dots \in (0, 1)$, we consider probability measures $\nu_n = \nu_{b_n, p_n}$ and their product, the probability measure $\nu = \nu_1 \times \nu_2 \times \dots$ on the set $b_1 \times b_2 \times \dots$ of sequences $(x_n)_n$, $x_n \in b_n$. We note that $\sup_n x_n \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ for all such sequences and ask, whether or not

$$\text{(7a4)} \qquad \sup_n x_n \in C \quad \text{for } \nu\text{-almost all sequences } (x_n)_n \, ,$$

or equivalently,

$$\text{(7a5)} \qquad \lim_m \lim_n \big(x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_m \vee (x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n)' \big) = 1_\Lambda \qquad \text{for } \nu\text{-almost all sequences } (x_n)_n \, .$$

7a6 Proposition. If (7a5) holds for all such $b_1, b_2, \dots$ and $p_1, p_2, \dots$ then B is classical.

In order to prove the implication (c) $\Longrightarrow$ (a) of Theorem 1c2 it is sufficient to prove Proposition 7a6. To this end we need spectral theory.

7b Spectrum as a measure class factorization

The projections Q_x for $x \in \mathrm{Cl}(B)$ commute by (4a7), and generate a commutative von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}$. Sect. 2d gives us a measure class space

$(S,\Sigma,\mathcal{M})$ and an isomorphism

(7b1) $$\alpha : \mathcal{A} \to L_\infty(S,\Sigma,\mathcal{M}) \, .$$

We call $(S,\Sigma,\mathcal{M})$ (endowed with α) the *spectral space* of B. Projections Q_x turn into indicators:

(7b2) $$\alpha(Q_x) = 1\!\!1_{S_x} \, , \quad S_x \in \Sigma \quad \text{for } x \in \operatorname{Cl}(B)$$

(of course, S_x is an equivalence class rather than a set); (4a9) gives

(7b3) $$S_x \cap S_y = S_{x \wedge y} \quad \text{for } x,y \in \operatorname{Cl}(B) \, .$$

(In contrast, the evident inclusion $S_x \cup S_y \subset S_{x \vee y}$ is generally strict.)
Claim:

(7b4) $$x_n \downarrow x \text{ implies } S_{x_n} \downarrow S_x \, ; \;\; \text{also } x_n \uparrow x \text{ implies } S_{x_n} \uparrow S_x \, ;$$

here $x, x_1, x_2, \dots \in \operatorname{Cl}(B)$. *Proof:* let $x_n \downarrow x$, then $Q_{x_n} \downarrow Q_x$, thus $\alpha(Q_{x_n}) \downarrow \alpha(Q_x)$ by (2d2), which means $S_{x_n} \downarrow S_x$; the case $x_n \uparrow x$ is similar.

The subspaces $H_x = Q_x H \subset H$ for $x \in \operatorname{Cl}(B)$ are a special case of the subspaces $H(E) = \alpha^{-1}(1\!\!1_E)H \subset H$ for $E \in \Sigma$ (recall (2d12)); by (7b2),

(7b5) $$H(S_x) = H_x \quad \text{for } x \in \operatorname{Cl}(B) \, .$$

Every subset of B leads to a subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}$. In particular, for every $x \in B$ we introduce the von Neumann algebra

(7b6)
$$\mathcal{A}_x \subset \mathcal{A} \quad \text{generated by} \quad \{ Q_y : y \in B, \, x \vee y = 1_\Lambda \} = \{ Q_{u \vee x'} : u \in B, \, u \le x \}$$

and the σ-field $\Sigma_x \subset \Sigma$ such that

(7b7) $$\alpha(\mathcal{A}_x) = L_\infty(\Sigma_x) \quad \text{for } x \in B$$

(see 2d6). Note that

(7b8) $$x \le y \quad \text{implies} \quad \mathcal{A}_x \subset \mathcal{A}_y \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_x \subset \Sigma_y \quad \text{for } x,y \in B \, .$$

Recall 2c2: $Q_u^{(x)} : H_x \to H_x$ for $u \le x$, and 2c3: given independent x, y, treating $H_{x \vee y}$ as $H_x \otimes H_y$ we have $Q_{u \vee v} = Q_u^{(x)} \otimes Q_v^{(y)}$ for all $u \le x$, $v \le y$. Introducing von Neumann algebras $\mathcal{A}^{(x)}$ of operators on H_x,

(7b9) $$\mathcal{A}^{(x)} \quad \text{generated by} \quad \{ Q_u^{(x)} : u \in B, \, u \le x \} \, ,$$

we get

$$\mathcal{A}^{(x\vee y)} = \mathcal{A}^{(x)} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{(y)} \quad \text{whenever } x \wedge y = 0\,,\ x, y \in B\,. \tag{7b10}$$

In the case $y = x'$, treating H as $H_x \otimes H_{x'}$ we have

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{(x)} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{(x')}\,, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_x = \mathcal{A}^{(x)} \otimes I \quad \text{for } x \in B \tag{7b11}$$

(for the latter, fix $v = x'$), — a natural isomorphism between $\mathcal{A}_x$ and $\mathcal{A}^{(x)}$. Thus, $\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(x)} \otimes I) = L_\infty(\Sigma_x)$, $\alpha(I \otimes \mathcal{A}^{(x')}) = L_\infty(\Sigma_{x'})$ and $\alpha(\mathcal{A}^{(x)} \otimes \mathcal{A}^{(x')}) = L_\infty(\Sigma)$. By 2d11, for all $x \in B$,

$$\Sigma_x \text{ and } \Sigma_{x'} \text{ are } \mathcal{M}\text{-independent}, \tag{7b12}$$

$$\Sigma_x \vee \Sigma_{x'} = \Sigma\,. \tag{7b13}$$

7b14 Remark. The closure of B determines uniquely the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ and therefore also the spectral space.

7c Restriction to a sub-σ-field

As was noted in Sect. 3d, for an arbitrary $x \in \Lambda$ the triple $(\Omega, x, P|_x)$ is also a probability space, and its lattice of σ-fields is naturally embedded into Λ:

$$\Lambda(\Omega, x, P|_x) = \Lambda_x = \{y \in \Lambda : y \le x\} \subset \Lambda\,.$$

Dealing with a noise-type Boolean algebra $B \subset \Lambda$ over $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ we introduce

$$B_x = B \cap \Lambda_x = \{u \in B : u \le x\} \subset B \quad \text{for } x \in B$$

and note that

$$B_x \subset \Lambda_x \text{ is a noise-type Boolean algebra over } (\Omega, x, P|_x)\,;$$

thus, notions introduced for B have their counterparts for B_x. We mark them by the *left* index x. Some of these counterparts were used in previous (sub)sections: for $x \in B$,

${}_xH = H_x\,;$ see 2a3

${}_xQ_u = Q_u^{(x)}$ for $u \in B_x\,;$ see 2c2

${}_x\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{(x)}\,;$ see (7b9)

${}_xS = S\,;\quad {}_x\Sigma = \Sigma_x\,;$ see (7b7)

${}_x\alpha : \mathcal{A}^{(x)} \to L_\infty(\Sigma_x)\,,\quad {}_x\alpha(A) = \alpha(A \otimes I)\,;$ see (7b11)

${}_xS_u = S_{u\vee x'}$ for $u \in B_x\,;$ see (7b2)

${}_xH^{(1)} = H^{(1)} \cap H_x\,;$

the last line follows easily from 5b1; the next to the last line holds, since ${}_x\alpha({}_xQ_u) = \alpha(Q_u^{(x)} \otimes I) = \alpha(Q_u^{(x)} \otimes Q_{x'}^{(x')}) = \alpha(Q_{u\vee x'})$. The counterpart of $H(E) = \alpha^{-1}(1\!\!1_E)H$ for $E \in \Sigma$ is ${}_xH(E) = {}_x\alpha^{-1}(1\!\!1_E)H_x$ for $E \in \Sigma_x$.

7c1 Lemma. For every $x \in B$, treating H as $H_x \otimes H_{x'}$ we have $H(E \cap F) = ({}_xH(E)) \otimes ({}_{x'}H(F))$ for all $E \in \Sigma_x$, $F \in \Sigma_{x'}$.

PROOF. We take $A \in \mathcal{A}^{(x)}$, $B \in \mathcal{A}^{(x')}$ such that $\alpha(A \otimes I) = 1\!\!1_E$, $\alpha(I \otimes B) = 1\!\!1_F$, then $\alpha(A \otimes B) = 1\!\!1_E 1\!\!1_F = 1\!\!1_{E\cap F}$ and $H(E \cap F) = (A \otimes B)(H_x \otimes H_{x'}) = (AH_x) \otimes (BH_{x'}) = ({}_xH(E)) \otimes ({}_{x'}H(F))$. $\square$

7d Classicality via spectrum

Let $b \subset B$ be a finite Boolean subalgebra. For every $s \in S$ the set $\{x \in b : s \in S_x\}$ is a filter on b due to (7b3); like every filter on a finite Boolean algebra, it is generated by some $x_b(s) \in b$:

$$\forall x \in b \quad \bigl(s \in S_x \iff x \geq x_b(s)\bigr)\,. \tag{7d1}$$

Like every element of b, $x_b(s)$ is the union of some of the atoms of b (recall (2e2)); the number of these atoms will be denoted by $K_b(s)$:

$$K_b(s) = \left|\{a \in \mathrm{Atoms}(b) : a \leq x_b(s)\}\right|.$$

For two finite Boolean subalgebras,

$$\text{if} \quad b_1 \subset b_2 \quad \text{then} \quad K_{b_1}(\cdot) \leq K_{b_2}(\cdot) \quad \text{and} \quad x_{b_1}(s) \geq x_{b_2}(s)\,. \tag{7d2}$$

Each K_b is an equivalence class (rather than a function), and the set of all b need not be countable. We take supremum in the complete lattice of all equivalence classes of measurable functions $S \to [0, +\infty]$ (recall Sect. 2f):

$$K = \sup_b K_b\,, \quad K : S \to [0, +\infty]\,, \tag{7d3}$$

where b runs over all finite Boolean subalgebras $b \subset B$.

7d4 Theorem. If $K(\cdot) < \infty$ almost everywhere then B is classical.

We split this theorem in two propositions as follows. Recall that classicality is defined by 1a3 as the equality $\sigma(H^{(1)}) = 1_\Lambda$. Introducing

$$E_k = \{s \in S : K(s) = k\} \quad \text{and} \quad H^{(k)} = H(E_k) \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

(recall (2d12)) we reformulate the condition $K(\cdot) < \infty$ as $S = \uplus_k E_k$ and further, by (2d13), as $H = \oplus_k H^{(k)}$. For $k = 1$ the new notation conforms to the old one in the following sense.

7d5 Proposition. $H(E_1)$ is equal to the first chaos space $H^{(1)}$ (defined by 1a2).

7d6 Proposition. $\sigma(H^{(k)}) \subset \sigma(H^{(1)})$ for all $k = 2, 3, \dots$

If $H = \oplus_k H^{(k)}$ then $1_\Lambda = \sup_k \sigma(H^{(k)}) = \sigma(H^{(1)})$. We see that Theorem 7d4 follows from Propositions 7d5, 7d6.

The proof of Proposition 7d5 is given after three lemmas.

We introduce minimal nontrivial finite Boolean subalgebras $b_x = \{0, x, x', 1\}$ for $x \in B$.

7d7 Lemma. For every $x \in B$,

$$\{f \in H : f = Q_x f + Q_{x'} f\} = H\bigl(\{s : K_{b_x}(s) = 1\}\bigr) \, .$$

PROOF. $\{s : K_{b_x}(s) = 1\} = \{s : K_{b_x}(s) \le 1\} \setminus \{s : K_{b_x}(s) = 0\} = (S_x \cup S_{x'}) \setminus S_0 = (S_x \setminus S_0) \uplus (S_{x'} \setminus S_0)$ (since $S_x \cap S_{x'} = S_0$), thus $H\bigl(\{s : K_{b_x}(s) = 1\}\bigr) = H(S_x \setminus S_0) \oplus H(S_{x'} \setminus S_0) = (H_x \ominus H_0) \oplus (H_{x'} \ominus H_0)$; use 5c2. $\square$

7d8 Lemma. Assume that $b_1, b_2 \subset B$ are finite Boolean subalgebras, and $b \subset B$ is the (finite by 2e3) Boolean subalgebra generated by b_1, b_2. Then

$$\{s : K_{b_1}(s) \le 1\} \cap \{s : K_{b_2}(s) \le 1\} \subset \{s : K_b(s) \le 1\} \, .$$

PROOF. If $K_{b_1}(s) \le 1$, $K_{b_2}(s) \le 1$ and $s \notin S_0$ then $x_{b_1}(s) \in \operatorname{Atoms}(b_1)$, $x_{b_2}(s) \in \operatorname{Atoms}(b_2)$, thus $x_b(s) \le x_{b_1}(s) \wedge x_{b_2}(s) \in \operatorname{Atoms}(b)$ by 2e3, therefore $K_b(s) \le 1$. $\square$

7d9 Lemma. $\{s : K(s) \le 1\} = \inf_{x \in B} \{s : K_{b_x}(s) \le 1\}$, and $\{s : K(s) = 1\} = \inf_{x \in B} \{s : K_{b_x}(s) = 1\}$ (the infimum of equivalence classes).

PROOF. Every finite Boolean subalgebra b is generated by the Boolean subalgebras b_x for $x \in b$; by 7d8, $\{s : K_b(s) \le 1\} \supset \bigcap_{x \in b} \{s : K_{b_x}(s) \le 1\}$; the infimum over all b gives $\{s : K(s) \le 1\} \supset \inf_{x \in B} \{s : K_{b_x}(s) \le 1\}$. The converse inclusion being trivial, we get the first equality. The second equality follows, since the set $\{s : K_b(s) = 0\}$ is equal to S_0, irrespective of b. $\square$

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 7d5. It follows from the second equality of 7d9, using (2f1), that $H(E_1) = \bigcap_{x \in B} H\bigl(\{s : K_{b_x}(s) = 1\}\bigr)$. Using 7d7 we get $H(E_1) = \bigcap_{x \in B} \{f \in H : f = Q_x f + Q_{x'} f\} = H^{(1)}$. $\square$

In order to prove Theorem 7d4 it remains to prove Proposition 7d6.

We have K introduced for B by (7d3), but also for B_x we have ${}_xK$, the counterpart of K in the sense of Sect. 7c;

$$ {}_xK = \sup_b {}_xK_b \, , \quad {}_xK : S \to [0,\infty] \quad \text{for } x \in B \, , $$

where b runs over all finite Boolean subalgebras $b \subset B_x$; ${}_xK$ is an equivalence class of Σ_x-measurable functions $S \to [0,\infty]$.

7d10 Lemma. ${}_{x\vee y}K = {}_xK + {}_yK$ for all $x, y \in B$ such that $x \wedge y = 0_\Lambda$.

Proof. When calculating ${}_{x\vee y}K$ we may restrict ourselves to finite subalgebras $b \subset B_{x\vee y}$ that contain x and y (recall (7d2)). Each such b may be thought of as a pair of $b_1 \subset B_x$ and $b_2 \subset B_y$. We have $\operatorname{Atoms}(b) = \operatorname{Atoms}(b_1) \uplus \operatorname{Atoms}(b_2)$, $x_b(s) = x_{b_1}(s) \vee x_{b_2}(s)$ (recall that ${}_xS_u = S_{u\vee x'}$ for $u \le x$), thus ${}_{x\vee y}K_b = {}_xK_{b_1} + {}_yK_{b_2}$; take the supremum in b_1, b_2. $\square$

7d11 Lemma. $\{s \in S : K(s) = 2\} = \sup_{x\in B}\{s \in S : {}_xK(s) = {}_{x'}K(s) = 1\}$ (the supremum of equivalence classes).

Proof. The "$\supset$" inclusion follows from (7d10); it is sufficient to prove that $\{s \in S : K(s) = 2\} \subset \cup_{x\in b_1\cup b_2\cup\dots}\{s \in S : {}_xK(s) = {}_{x'}K(s) = 1\}$ if $b_1 \subset b_2 \subset \dots$ satisfy $K_{b_n} \uparrow K$.

Given s such that $K(s) = 2$, we take n such that $K_{b_n}(s) = 2$, that is, $x_{b_n}(s)$ contains exactly two atoms of b_n. We choose $x \in b_n$ that contains exactly one of these two atoms; then ${}_xK_{b_n}(s) = {}_{x'}K_{b_n}(s) = 1$, therefore ${}_xK(s) = {}_{x'}K(s) = 1$, since $1 = {}_xK_{b_n}(s) \le {}_xK(s) = K(s) - {}_{x'}K(s) \le 2 - {}_{x'}K_{b_n}(s) = 1$. $\square$

We use the counterpart (in the sense of Sect. 7c) of Proposition 7d5: ${}_xH({}_xE_1) = {}_xH^{(1)}$, that is, for every $x \in B$,

$$ {}_xH\big(\{s \in S : {}_xK(s) = 1\}\big) = H^{(1)} \cap H_x \, . \tag{7d12} $$

Proof of Proposition 7d6 for $k = 2$. It follows from 7d11 and (2f2) that $H^{(2)}$ is generated (as a closed linear subspace of H) by the union, over all $x \in B$, of the subspaces $H\big(\{s \in S : {}_xK(s) = {}_{x'}K(s) = 1\}\big)$. In order to get $\sigma(H^{(2)}) \subset \sigma(H^{(1)})$ it is sufficient to prove that

$$ \sigma\big(H\big(\{s \in S : {}_xK(s) = {}_{x'}K(s) = 1\}\big)\big) \subset \sigma(H^{(1)}) \quad \text{for all } x \in B \, . \tag{7d13} $$

By (7c1) and (7d12), $H\big(\{s \in S : {}_xK(s) = {}_{x'}K(s) = 1\}\big) = {}_xH\big(\{s \in S : {}_xK(s) = 1\}\big) \otimes {}_{x'}H\big(\{s \in S : {}_{x'}K(s) = 1\}\big) = (H_x \cap H^{(1)}) \otimes (H_{x'} \cap H^{(1)})$, which implies (7d13). $\square$

The proof of Proposition 7d6 for higher k is similar. Lemma 7d11 is generalized to

$$\{s \in S : K(s) = k\} = \sup_{x \in B} \{s \in S : {}_xK(s) = k-1, \; {}_{x'}K(s) = 1\} \, ,$$

and (7d13) — to

$$\sigma\bigl(H\bigl(\{s \in S : {}_xK(s) = k-1, \; {}_{x'}K(s) = 1\}\bigr)\bigr) \subset \sigma(H^{(k-1)} \cup H^{(1)}) \, .$$

Thus, $\sigma(H^{(k)}) \subset \sigma(H^{(k-1)} \cup H^{(1)})$. By induction in k, $\sigma(H^{(k)}) \subset \sigma(H^{(1)})$, which completes the proof of Proposition 7d6 and Theorem 7d4.

7e Finishing the proof

7e1 Proposition. If (7a5) holds for all $b_1 \subset b_2 \subset \dots$ and $p_1, p_2, \dots \in (0,1)$ then $K(\cdot) < \infty$ almost everywhere.

By Theorem 7d4, in order to prove Proposition 7a6 it is sufficient to prove Proposition 7e1.

The relation $\lim_m \lim_n (y_m \vee y'_n) = 1_\Lambda$ for $y_1 \le y_2 \le \dots$ (appearing in (7a5) with $y_n = x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n$) may be reformulated in spectral terms using (7b4); it turns into $\cup_m \cap_n S_{y_m \vee y'_n} = S$, in other words, almost every $s \in S$ satisfies $\exists m \, \forall n \;\; s \in S_{y_m \vee y'_n}$. Accordingly, (7a5) may be rewritten as follows:

$$\text{(7e2)} \quad \text{for } \nu\text{-almost all sequences } (x_n)_n \, , \quad \text{for almost all } s \in S \, , \qquad \exists m \; \forall n \quad s \in S_{x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_m \vee (x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_n)'} \, .$$

We choose $p_1, p_2, \dots \in (0,1)$ and $c_1, c_2, \dots \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ such that

$$\sum_n p_n < 1 \, , \tag{7e3}$$

$$(1 - p_n)^{c_n} \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty \, . \tag{7e4}$$

We also choose finite Boolean subalgebras $b_1 \subset b_2 \subset \dots \subset B$ such that $K_{b_n} \uparrow K$ and introduce $b = b_1 \cup b_2 \cup \dots \subset B$ (a countable Boolean subalgebra). *Claim:*

$$ {}_xK_{b_n} \uparrow {}_xK \quad \text{for every } x \in b \, . \tag{7e5}$$

Proof: ${}_xK \ge \lim_n {}_xK_{b_n} = \lim_n \bigl(K_{b_n} - {}_{x'}K_{b_n}\bigr) \ge K - {}_{x'}K = {}_xK$. *Remark:* for $x \in b_n$, by ${}_xK_{b_n}$ we mean ${}_xK_{b_n \cap B_x}$. Thus, ${}_xK_{b_n}$ is well-defined for all n large enough, provided that $x \in b$.

Using 2f3 we take $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ such that for almost every $s \in S$

$$\begin{gathered} \text{either } {}_xK(s) < \infty\,, \\ \text{or } {}_xK_{b_{n_k}}(s) \ge c_k \text{ for all } k \text{ large enough.} \end{gathered} \tag{7e6}$$

These n_k depend on $x \in b$. However, countably many x can be served by a single sequence $(n_k)_k$ using the well-known diagonal argument. This way we ensure (7e6) with a single $(n_k)_k$ for all $x \in b$. Now we rename b_{n_k} into b_k, discard a null set of bad points $s \in S$ and get

$$\begin{gathered} \text{either } {}_xK(s) < \infty\,, \\ \text{or } {}_xK_{b_n}(s) \ge c_n \text{ for all } n \text{ large enough} \end{gathered} \tag{7e7}$$

for all $x \in b$ and $s \in S$; here "n large enough" means $n \ge n_0(x,s)$.

We recall the product measure $\nu = \nu_1 \times \nu_2 \times \dots$ introduced in Sect. 7a on the product set $b_1 \times b_2 \times \dots$; as before, $\nu_n = \nu_{b_n,p_n}$. For notational convenience we treat the coordinate maps $X_n : (b_1 \times b_2 \times \dots, \nu) \to b_n$, $X_n(x_1, x_2, \dots) = x_n$, as independent b_n-valued random variables; X_n is distributed ν_n, that is, $\mathbb{P}\big(X_n = x \big) = \nu_n(\{x\})$ for $x \in b_n$. We introduce b_n-valued random variables

$$Y_n = X_1 \vee \dots \vee X_n\,.$$

7e8 Lemma. $\mathbb{P}\big({}_{Y'_n}K(s) < \infty \big) \le p_1 + \dots + p_n$ for all $s \in S$ such that $K(s) = \infty$ and all n.

Proof. There exists $a \in \operatorname{Atoms}(b_n)$ such that ${}_aK(s) = \infty$ (since $\sum_a {}_aK(s) = K(s) = \infty$). We have ${}_{Y'_n}K(s) < \infty \implies a \le Y_n \implies \exists k \in \{1, \dots, n\}\ \ a \le X_k$, therefore $\mathbb{P}\big({}_{Y'_n}K(s) < \infty \big) \le \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{P}\big(a \le X_k \big) = \sum_{k=1}^n p_k$. ☐

7e9 Lemma. If $x \in b_m$ and $s \in S$ satisfy ${}_xK(s) = \infty$ then

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\forall n > m \quad X_n \wedge x \wedge x_{b_n}(s) = 0_\Lambda \big) = 0\,.$$

Proof. For $n > m$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(X_n \wedge x \wedge x_{b_n}(s) = 0_\Lambda \big) = (1 - p_n)^{{}_xK_{b_n}(s)}\,,$$

since $x \wedge x_{b_n}(s)$ contains ${}_xK_{b_n}(s)$ atoms of b_n. By (7e7), ${}_xK_{b_n}(s) \ge c_n$ for all n large enough. Thus, $\mathbb{P}\big(X_n \wedge x \wedge x_{b_n}(s) = 0_\Lambda \big) \le (1 - p_n)^{c_n} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ by (7e4). ☐

7e10 Lemma.

$$\mathbb{P}\big({}_{Y'_m}K(s) = \infty \text{ and } \forall n > m\ \ s \in S_{Y_m \vee Y'_n} \big) = 0$$

for all $s \in S$ and m.

PROOF. By (7d1), $s \in S_{Y_m \vee Y'_n} \iff Y_m \vee Y'_n \ge x_{b_n}(s)$ for $n > m$. We have to prove that

$$\mathbb{P}\big(Y'_m = y \text{ and } \forall n > m \;\; y' \vee Y'_n \ge x_{b_n}(s) \big) = 0$$

for every $y \in b_m$ satisfying ${}_yK(s) = \infty$. By 7e9,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\forall n > m \;\; X_n \wedge y \wedge x_{b_n}(s) = 0_\Lambda \big) = 0\,.$$

It remains to note that $y' \vee Y'_n \ge x_{b_n}(s) \iff (y \wedge Y_n)' \ge x_{b_n}(s) \iff (y \wedge Y_n) \wedge x_{b_n}(s) = 0_\Lambda \implies y \wedge X_n \wedge x_{b_n}(s) = 0_\Lambda$. ☐

Now we prove Proposition 7e1. We use (7e2) for $b_1, b_2, \dots$ and $p_1, p_2, \dots$ satisfying (7e3), (7e4):

$$\exists m \;\; \forall n \quad s \in S_{Y_m \vee Y'_n}$$

almost surely, for almost all $s \in S$. In combination with 7e10 it gives

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\exists m \;\; {}_{Y'_m}K(s) < \infty \big) = 1$$

for almost all $s \in S$. On the other hand, by 7e8 and (7e3),

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\exists m \;\; {}_{Y'_m}K(s) < \infty \big) = \lim_m \mathbb{P}\big({}_{Y'_m}K(s) < \infty \big) \le p_1 + p_2 + \dots < 1$$

for all $s \in S$ such that $K(s) = \infty$. Therefore $K(s) < \infty$ for almost all s, which completes the proof of Proposition 7e1, Proposition 7a6 and finally, Theorem 1c2. Theorem 1c1 follows immediately.

References

[1] ARAKI, H. and WOODS, E. J. (1966). Complete Boolean algebras of type I factors. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. Ser. A* **2** 157–242. MR0203497

[2] ARVESON, W. (2003). *Noncommutative dynamics and E-semigroups.* Springer-Verlag, New York. MR1978577

[3] CONWAY, J. B. (2000). *A course in operator theory.* Amer. Math. Soc. MR1721402

[4] DAVEY, B. A. and PRIESTLY, H. A. (2002). *Introduction to lattices and order*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press. MR1902334

[5] DIXMIER, J. (1981). *Von Neumann algebras.* North-Holland (transl. from French 1969). MR0641217

[6] Ellis, T. and Feldheim, O. N. (2011). The Brownian web is a two-dimensional black noise. *In preparation.*

[7] Émery, M. and Schachermayer, W. (1999). A remark on Tsirelson's stochastic differential equation. *Lect. Notes in Math.* **1709** 291–303. MR1768002

[8] Feldman, J. (1971). Decomposable processes and continuous products of probability spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.* **8** 1–51. MR0290436

[9] Halmos, P. R. (1963). *Lectures on Boolean algebras.* Van Nostrand, Princeton. MR0167440

[10] Halmos, P. R. (1967). *A Hilbert space problem book.* Van Nostrand, Princeton. MR0208368

[11] Pedersen, G. K. (1989). *Analysis now.* Springer-Verlag. MR0971256

[12] Powers, R. T. (1987). A nonspatial continuous semigroup of $*$-endomorphisms of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{H})$. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **23**:6 1053–1069. MR0935715

[13] Schramm, O., Smirnov, S. with an appendix by Garban, C. (2011). On the scaling limits of planar percolation. *Ann. Probab.* **39**:5 1768–1814. Also arXiv:1101.5820.

[14] Šidák, Z. (1957). On relations between strict sense and wide sense conditional expectations. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **2** 283–288. MR0092249

[15] Takesaki, M. (1979). *Theory of operator algebras* **1**. Springer-Verlag. MR0548728

[16] Tsirelson, B. (2003). Non-isomorphic product systems. arXiv:math.FA/0210457. *Advances in Quantum Dynamics*, Contemp. Math. **335**, AMS, pp. 273–328. MR2029632. Also arXiv:math.FA/0210457.

[17] Tsirelson, B. (2004). Scaling limit, noise, stability. *Lect. Notes in Math.* **1840** 1–106. Springer, Berlin. MR2079671. Also arXiv:math.PR/0301237.

[18] Tsirelson, B. (2004). Nonclassical stochastic flows and continuous products. *Probability Surveys* **1** 173–298. MR2068474

[19] Tsirelson, B. S. and Vershik, A. M. (1998). Examples of nonlinear continuous tensor products of measure spaces and non-Fock factorizations. *Rev. in Math. Phys.* **10**:1 81–145. MR1606855

[20] Williams, D. (1991). *Probability with martingales.* Cambridge University Press. MR1155402

Boris Tsirelson
School of Mathematics
Tel Aviv University
Tel Aviv 69978, Israel

`mailto:tsirel@post.tau.ac.il`
`http://www.tau.ac.il/~tsirel/`